

Hierarchical Identity-Based Lossy Trapdoor Functions

Alex Escala¹, Javier Herranz¹, Benoît Libert², and Carla Ràfols³

¹ Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Dept. Matemàtica Aplicada IV (Spain)
e-mail: {alex.escala,jherranz}@ma4.upc.edu

² Université catholique de Louvain, ICTEAM Institute – Crypto Group (Belgium)
e-mail: benoit.libert@uclouvain.be

³ Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Horst Görtz Institut für IT-Sicherheit (Germany)
e-mail: Carla.Rafols@rub.de

Abstract. Lossy trapdoor functions, introduced by Peikert and Waters (STOC’08), have received a lot of attention in the last years, because of their wide range of applications in theoretical cryptography. The notion has been recently extended to the identity-based scenario by Bellare *et al.* (Eurocrypt’12). We provide one more step in this direction, by considering the notion of hierarchical identity-based lossy trapdoor functions (HIB-LTDFs). Hierarchical identity-based cryptography generalizes identity-based cryptography in the sense that identities are organized in a hierarchical way; a parent identity has more power than its descendants, because it can generate valid secret keys for them. Hierarchical identity-based cryptography has been proved very useful both for practical applications and to establish theoretical relations with other cryptographic primitives.

In order to realize HIB-LTDFs, we first build a weakly secure hierarchical predicate encryption scheme. This scheme, which may be of independent interest, is then used as a key ingredient to design a HIB-LTDF. By appropriately choosing parameters, the resulting function can be proved secure against either selective or adaptive adversaries although the underlying predicate encryption system is only selectively secure. Combining this new function with well-known results in the area, we notably obtain hierarchical identity-based encryption schemes and forward-secure cryptosystems that are deterministic or maintain some security when messages are encrypted using randomness of poor quality.

1 Introduction

(IDENTITY-BASED) LOSSY TRAPDOOR FUNCTIONS. Lossy trapdoor functions, as introduced by Peikert and Waters in [25], have been proved very powerful in theoretical cryptography and received a lot of attention in the recent years (see, e.g., [16,19,23,11,20,29]). Roughly speaking, a lossy trapdoor function is a family of functions that can be instantiated in two different modes. In the injective mode, the function is injective and can be inverted using the corresponding trapdoor. In lossy mode, the function is (highly) non-injective since its image size is much smaller than the size of the domain. The key point is that lossy instantiations of the function must be indistinguishable from injective instantiations.

In their seminal paper [25], Peikert and Waters showed that lossy trapdoor functions provide black-box constructions of chosen-plaintext secure (IND-CPA) and chosen-ciphertext secure (IND-CCA) public-key encryption schemes, universal one-way and collision-resistant hash functions. Later on, other applications of lossy trapdoor functions were discovered: they gave rise to deterministic encryption schemes [4] in the standard model [8], public-key encryption hedged schemes maintaining some security in the absence of reliable encryption coins [5] and even public key encryption with selective-opening security [6] (*i.e.*, which offer certain security guarantees in case of sender corruption).

Very recently, Bellare, Kiltz, Peikert and Waters [7] introduced the notion of identity-based lossy trapdoor function, which is the analogue of lossy trapdoor functions in the setting of identity-based

cryptography [28]. In the identity-based scenario, users' public keys are directly derived from their identities, whereas secret keys are delivered by a trusted master entity. In this way, the need for digital certificates, which usually bind public keys to users in traditional public-key cryptography, is drastically reduced. Moreover, identity-based lossy trapdoor functions (IB-LTDFs) often lead to the same cryptographic results as lossy trapdoor functions, but in the identity-based setting. Namely, in the case of selective adversaries (who choose their target identity upfront in the attack game), they imply identity-based deterministic encryption and identity-based hedged encryption.

Bellare *et al.* [7] proposed instantiations of identity-based lossy trapdoor functions based on bilinear maps and on lattices (as noted in [7], almost all IBE schemes belong to these families). The former makes clever use of an anonymous IBE system (where the ciphertext hides the receiver's identity) with pseudorandom ciphertexts whereas the latter relies on lossiness properties of learning-with-error-based cryptosystems.

Throughout the last decade, several generalizations of identity-based cryptography were put forth, including hierarchical identity-based cryptography [17], attribute-based cryptography [26,18] or predicate-based cryptography [9,21]. In this work, we will focus on the setting of hierarchical identity-based cryptography. Therein, the identities are organized in a hierarchical way, so that a user who holds the secret key of an identity id can generate, use and distribute valid secret keys for any identity that is a descendant of id in the hierarchy. Hierarchical identity-based encryption (HIBE) is of great interest due to both practical and theoretical reasons. On the practical side, many organizations and systems that may need (identity-based) cryptographic solutions are organized in a hierarchical way. On the theoretical side, generic constructions [12,13] are known to transform a weakly secure HIBE scheme (*i.e.*, IND-CPA security against selective adversaries) into (public-key) encryption schemes with strong security properties, like chosen-ciphertext security [13] or forward-security [3,12], where private keys are updated in such a way that past encryptions remain safe after a private key exposure.

OUR CONTRIBUTION. This paper extends to the hierarchical setting the notion of identity-based lossy trapdoor function. It is worth mentioning that, using lattice basis delegation algorithms [14], the lattice-based function of Bellare *et al.* [7] may easily lend itself to a hierarchical extension. Here, we focus on pairing-based systems where, as already mentioned in [7], greater challenges are faced. Indeed, currently available lattice-based HIBE systems [14,1,2] natively provide anonymity whereas, in the hierarchical scenario, anonymity has been harder to obtain in the world of pairings: indeed, the first anonymous HIBE construction [10] appeared four years after the first collusion-resistant HIBE [17]. Moreover, not all anonymous IBE systems seem amenable for constructing IB-LTDFs, as noted in [7] where a new scheme was specially designed for that.

Using bilinear maps, we thus construct a hierarchical identity-based lossy trapdoor function (HIB-LTDF) whose security relies on relatively weak hardness assumptions in groups of prime order. As an intermediate step, we design a hierarchical predicate encryption (HPE) system [27,24] with suitable anonymity properties, which may be of independent interest. Perhaps surprisingly, although this scheme is proved secure only against weak *selective* adversaries (who select their target attribute set before seeing the public parameters), we are able to turn it into a HIB-LTDF providing security (namely, partial lossiness as defined in [7]) against *adaptive* adversaries for a constant number of levels.

Beyond its hierarchical nature, our construction brings up an alternative design principle for (H)IB-LTDFs: while the pairing-based construction of Bellare *et al.* [7] builds on an adaptively secure anonymous IBE, our (hierarchical) IB-LTDF is obtained from a *selectively* weakly attribute-

hiding (hierarchical) predicate encryption system. In comparison with [7], we thus start from a more powerful primitive – because predicate encryption implies anonymous IBE – but only need a weaker security level to begin with. Both HIB-LTDF constructions rely on specific algebraic properties in the underlying IBE/HPE and neither is generic.

Combining our HIB-LTDF with existing results in public-key cryptography, we obtain the following results: (1) the first selectively secure hierarchical identity-based deterministic encryption scheme, (2) the first selectively secure hierarchical identity-based encryption scheme that hedges against bad randomness as advocated by Bellare *et al.* [5], (3) the first forward-secure deterministic and “hedged” encryption schemes. Although our scheme is not practical due to large ciphertexts and key sizes, it provides the first feasibility results in these directions.

ORGANIZATION. After recalling the necessary computational assumptions and the syntax of hierarchical predicate encryption, we introduce in Section 2 the new notion of hierarchical identity-based lossy trapdoor functions: we describe the protocols of such functions, and the required security property of partial lossiness (in both a selective and an adaptive setting). Then, we propose and analyze a new hierarchical predicate encryption scheme in Section 3, which is later used as a key ingredient in Section 4, where we construct a specific hierarchical identity-based lossy trapdoor function and we prove its security.

2 Background and Definitions

2.1 Complexity Assumptions

We consider groups $(\mathbb{G}, \hat{\mathbb{G}}, \mathbb{G}_T)$ of prime order p for which an asymmetric bilinear map $e : \mathbb{G} \times \hat{\mathbb{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_T$ is efficiently computable. We will assume that the DDH assumption holds in both $\mathbb{G}$ and $\hat{\mathbb{G}}$, which implies that no isomorphism is efficiently computable in either direction between $\mathbb{G}$ and $\hat{\mathbb{G}}$. In this setting, the assumptions that we need are sometimes somewhat stronger than DDH. However, these assumptions have constant size and they are not new: for example, the second one was used in [15].

The Bilinear Diffie Hellman Assumption (BDH): in bilinear groups $(\mathbb{G}, \hat{\mathbb{G}}, \mathbb{G}_T)$ of prime order p , it is computationally infeasible to distinguish the the distributions

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 &= \{(g, g^a, g^c, \hat{g}, \hat{g}^a, \hat{g}^b, e(g, \hat{g})^{abc}) \mid a, b, c \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p\}, \\ D_2 &= \{(g, g^a, g^c, \hat{g}, \hat{g}^a, \hat{g}^b, e(g, \hat{g})^z) \mid a, b, c, z \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p\}. \end{aligned}$$

The $\mathcal{P}$ -BDH₁ Assumption: in asymmetric bilinear groups $(\mathbb{G}, \hat{\mathbb{G}}, \mathbb{G}_T)$ of prime order p , the distributions

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 &= \{(g, g^b, g^{ab}, g^c, \hat{g}, \hat{g}^a, \hat{g}^b, g^{abc}) \mid a, b, c \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p\}, \\ D_2 &= \{(g, g^b, g^{ab}, g^c, \hat{g}, \hat{g}^a, \hat{g}^b, g^z) \mid a, b, c, z \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p\}. \end{aligned}$$

are indistinguishable for any probabilistic polynomial time (PPT) algorithm.

The DDH₂ Assumption: in asymmetric bilinear groups $(\mathbb{G}, \hat{\mathbb{G}}, \mathbb{G}_T)$ of prime order p , the following distributions are computationally indistinguishable

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 &= \{(g, \hat{g}, \hat{g}^a, \hat{g}^b, \hat{g}^{ab}) \mid a, b \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p\} \\ D_2 &= \{(g, \hat{g}, \hat{g}^a, \hat{g}^b, \hat{g}^z) \mid a, b, z \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p\}. \end{aligned}$$

2.2 Definitions for Hierarchical Predicate Encryption

A tuple of integers $\vec{\nu} = (\mu_1, d; \nu_1, \dots, \nu_d)$ such that $\nu_0 = 0 \leq \nu_1 < \nu_2 < \dots < \nu_d = \mu_1$ is called a *format hierarchy* of depth d . Such a hierarchy is associated with attribute spaces $\{\Sigma_i\}_{i=0}^d$. In our setting, we set $\Sigma_i = \mathbb{Z}_p^{\nu_i - \nu_{i-1}} \setminus \{\vec{0}\}$ for $i = 1$ to d , for some $p \in \mathbb{N}$, and also define the universe of hierarchical attributes as $\Sigma := \cup_{i=1}^d (\Sigma_1 \times \dots \times \Sigma_i)$. For vectors $\{\vec{X}_i \in \Sigma_i\}_{i \in \{1, \dots, d\}}$, we will consider the (inner-product) hierarchical predicate $f_{(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)}(\vec{Y}_1, \dots, \vec{Y}_\kappa) = 1$ iff $\ell \leq \kappa$ and $\vec{X}_i \cdot \vec{Y}_i = 0$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$. The space of hierarchical predicates is defined to be

$$\mathcal{F} = \{f_{(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)} \mid \{\vec{X}_i \in \Sigma_i\}_{i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}}\}$$

and the integer κ (resp. ℓ) is called the depth (resp. the level) of $(\vec{Y}_1, \dots, \vec{Y}_\kappa)$ (resp. $(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)$).

Let $\vec{\nu} = (\mu_1, d; \nu_1, \dots, \nu_d)$ be a format hierarchy. A hierarchical predicate encryption (HPE) scheme for a predicate family $\mathcal{F}$ consists of these algorithms.

Setup $(\lambda, \vec{\nu})$: takes as input a security parameter $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$ and a format hierarchy $\vec{\nu} = (n_1, d; \nu_1, \dots, \nu_d)$.

It outputs a master secret key **msk** and a master public key **mpk** that includes the description of a hierarchical attribute space Σ .

Keygen $(\text{msk}, (\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell))$: takes as input predicate vectors $(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell) \in \Sigma_1 \times \dots \times \Sigma_\ell$ and the master secret key **msk**. It outputs a private key $SK_{(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)}$.

Encrypt $(\text{mpk}, (\vec{Y}_1, \dots, \vec{Y}_\kappa), M)$: takes as input attribute vectors $(\vec{Y}_1, \dots, \vec{Y}_\kappa) \in \Sigma_1 \times \dots \times \Sigma_\kappa$, the master public key **mpk** and a message M . It outputs a ciphertext C .

Decrypt $(\text{mpk}, (\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell), SK_{(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)}, C)$: takes in a private key $SK_{(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)}$ for the vectors $(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)$, the master public key **mpk** and a ciphertext C . It outputs a plaintext M or $\perp$.

Delegate $(\text{mpk}, (\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell), SK_{(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)}, \vec{X}_{\ell+1})$: takes in a ℓ -th level private key $SK_{(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)}$, the corresponding vectors $(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)$ and a vector $\vec{X}_{\ell+1}$. It outputs a $(\ell + 1)$ -th level private key $SK_{(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell, \vec{X}_{\ell+1})}$.

Correctness mandates that, for any message M and vectors $\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell, \vec{Y}_1, \dots, \vec{Y}_\kappa$,

$$\text{Decrypt}(\text{mpk}, (\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell), SK_{(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)}, \text{Encrypt}(\text{mpk}, (\vec{Y}_1, \dots, \vec{Y}_\kappa), M)) = M$$

whenever $f_{(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)}(\vec{Y}_1, \dots, \vec{Y}_\kappa) = 1$.

Following [24], we write $f' \leq f$ to express that the predicate vector of f is a prefix of that for f' , meaning that f' is at least as constraining as f .

Definition 1. A Hierarchical Predicate Encryption scheme is **selectively weakly attribute-hiding** if no PPT adversary has non-negligible advantage in the following game:

1. The adversary $\mathcal{A}$ chooses a format hierarchy $\vec{\nu} = (n_1, d; \nu_1, \dots, \nu_d)$ and vectors $(\vec{Y}_1^0, \dots, \vec{Y}_{d^*}^0)$, $(\vec{Y}_1^1, \dots, \vec{Y}_{d^*}^1)$, for some $d^* \leq d$. The challenger generates a master key pair $(\text{msk}, \text{mpk}) \leftarrow \text{Setup}(\lambda, \vec{\nu})$ and **mpk** is given to $\mathcal{A}$.
2. $\mathcal{A}$ is allowed to make a number of adaptive queries.
 - **Create-key**: $\mathcal{A}$ provides a predicate $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and the challenger creates a private key SK_f for f without revealing it to $\mathcal{A}$.

- **Create-delegated-key:** $\mathcal{A}$ chooses a private key that was previously created for some predicate f and also specifies another predicate $f' \leq f$ that f is a prefix of. The challenger then computes a delegated key $SK_{f'}$ for f' without revealing it to $\mathcal{A}$.
- **Reveal-key:** $\mathcal{A}$ asks the challenger to give out a previously created key.

For each Reveal-key query $(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)$, it is required that

$$f_{(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)}(\vec{Y}_1^0, \dots, \vec{Y}_{d^*}^0) = f_{(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)}(\vec{Y}_1^1, \dots, \vec{Y}_{d^*}^1) = 0.$$

3. $\mathcal{A}$ outputs messages M_0, M_1 . Then, the challenger chooses $\beta \xleftarrow{R} \{0, 1\}$ and computes a challenge ciphertext $C^* = \mathbf{Encrypt}(\mathbf{mpk}, (\vec{Y}_1^\beta, \dots, \vec{Y}_{d^*}^\beta), M_\beta)$, which is sent to $\mathcal{A}$.
4. $\mathcal{A}$ makes further private key queries for hierarchical vectors $(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)$ under the same restriction as above.
5. $\mathcal{A}$ outputs a bit $\beta' \in \{0, 1\}$ and wins if $\beta' = \beta$.

$\mathcal{A}$'s advantage is quantified as the distance $\mathbf{Adv}(\mathcal{A}) = |\Pr[\beta' = \beta] - 1/2|$.

2.3 Definitions for Hierarchical Identity-Based Lossy Trapdoor Functions

In this section we extend to the hierarchical scenario the definitions for identity-based (lossy) trapdoor functions given in [7].

SYNTAX. A hierarchical identity-based trapdoor function (HIB-TDF) is a tuple of efficient algorithms $\mathbf{HF} = (\mathbf{HF.Setup}, \mathbf{HF.MKg}, \mathbf{HF.Kg}, \mathbf{HF.Del}, \mathbf{HF.Eval}, \mathbf{HF.Inv})$. The setup algorithm $\mathbf{HF.Setup}$ takes as input a security parameter λ and outputs a set of global public parameters $\mathbf{pms}$, which specifies an input space $\mathbf{InpSp}$, an identity space $\mathbf{IdSp}$ and the necessary mathematical objects and hash functions. The master key generation algorithm $\mathbf{HF.MKg}$ takes as input $\mathbf{pms}$ and outputs a master public key $\mathbf{mpk}$ and a master secret key $\mathbf{msk}$. The key generation algorithm $\mathbf{HF.Kg}$ takes as input $\mathbf{pms}$, $\mathbf{msk}$ and a hierarchical identity $(\mathbf{id}_1, \dots, \mathbf{id}_\ell) \in \mathbf{IdSp}$, for some $\ell \geq 1$ and outputs a secret key $\mathbf{SK}_{(\mathbf{id}_1, \dots, \mathbf{id}_\ell)}$. The delegation algorithm $\mathbf{HF.Del}$ takes as input $\mathbf{pms}$, $\mathbf{msk}$, a hierarchical identity $(\mathbf{id}_1, \dots, \mathbf{id}_\ell)$, a secret key $\mathbf{SK}_{(\mathbf{id}_1, \dots, \mathbf{id}_\ell)}$ for it, and an additional identity $\mathbf{id}_{\ell+1}$; the output is a secret key $\mathbf{SK}_{(\mathbf{id}_1, \dots, \mathbf{id}_\ell, \mathbf{id}_{\ell+1})}$ for the hierarchical identity $(\mathbf{id}_1, \dots, \mathbf{id}_\ell, \mathbf{id}_{\ell+1})$ iff $(\mathbf{id}_1, \dots, \mathbf{id}_\ell, \mathbf{id}_{\ell+1}) \in \mathbf{IdSp}$. The evaluation algorithm $\mathbf{HF.Eval}$ takes as input $\mathbf{pms}$, $\mathbf{msk}$, a hierarchical identity $\mathbf{id} = (\mathbf{id}_1, \dots, \mathbf{id}_\ell)$ and a value $X \in \mathbf{InpSp}$; the result of the evaluation is denoted as C . Finally, the inversion algorithm $\mathbf{HF.Inv}$ takes as input $\mathbf{pms}$, $\mathbf{msk}$, a hierarchical identity $\mathbf{id} = (\mathbf{id}_1, \dots, \mathbf{id}_\ell)$, a secret key $\mathbf{SK}_{\mathbf{id}}$ for it and an evaluation C , and outputs a value $\tilde{X} \in \mathbf{InpSp}$.

A HIB-TDF satisfies the property of correctness if

$$\mathbf{HF.Inv}(\mathbf{pms}, \mathbf{mpk}, \mathbf{id}, \mathbf{SK}_{\mathbf{id}}, \mathbf{HF.Eval}(\mathbf{pms}, \mathbf{mpk}, \mathbf{id} = (\mathbf{id}_1, \dots, \mathbf{id}_\ell), X)) = X,$$

for any $X \in \mathbf{InpSp}$, any $\mathbf{pms}, (\mathbf{mpk}, \mathbf{msk})$ generated by $\mathbf{HF.Setup}$ and $\mathbf{HF.MKg}$, any hierarchical identity $(\mathbf{id}_1, \dots, \mathbf{id}_\ell) \in \mathbf{IdSp}$ and any secret key $\mathbf{SK}_{(\mathbf{id}_1, \dots, \mathbf{id}_\ell)}$ generated either by running $\mathbf{HF.Kg}(\mathbf{pms}, \mathbf{msk}, (\mathbf{id}_1, \dots, \mathbf{id}_\ell))$ or by applying the delegation algorithm $\mathbf{HF.Del}$ to secret keys of shorter hierarchical identities.

A particular way of constructing HIB-TDFs is to consider extended HIB-TDFs; the only difference between HIB-TDFs and extended HIB-TDFs is that, in the latter, the algorithm $\mathbf{HF.Setup}$ specifies in $\mathbf{pms}$ an auxiliary input space $\mathbf{AuxSp}$, and $\mathbf{HF.MKg}$ takes as additional auxiliary input

$aux \in \text{AuxSp}$.

SECURITY. The basic security property of a trapdoor function is *one-wayness*, which means that an adversary cannot invert the function without the suitable secret key. *Partial lossiness* was introduced in [7], where it was also proven to imply one-wayness. This result is easily extended to the hierarchical scenario, and for this reason, we focus on the property of partial lossiness. Before giving its formal definition, let us recall the notion of *lossiness*: if f is a function with domain $\text{Dom}(f)$ and image $\text{Im}(f) = \{f(x) : x \in \text{Dom}(f)\}$, we say that f is ω -lossy if $\lambda(f) \geq \omega$, where $\lambda(f) = \log \frac{|\text{Dom}(f)|}{|\text{Im}(f)|}$.

Let $\text{HF} = (\text{HF.Setup}, \text{HF.MKg}, \text{HF.Kg}, \text{HF.Del}, \text{HF.Eval}, \text{HF.Inv})$ be a HIB-TDF. A *sibling* for HF is an extended HIB-TDF $\text{LHF} = (\text{HF.Setup}, \text{LHF.MKg}, \text{LHF.Kg}, \text{HF.Del}, \text{HF.Eval}, \text{HF.Inv})$ whose global setup, delegation, evaluation and inversion algorithms are those of HF , and where an auxiliary space AuxSp is contained in $\text{pms} \leftarrow \text{HF.Setup}(\lambda)$.

We say that a hierarchical identity $\text{id} = (\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_\ell)$ is a prefix of another one $\text{id}^* = (\text{id}_1^*, \dots, \text{id}_{\ell^*}^*)$ if $\ell \leq \ell^*$ and $\text{id}_i = \text{id}_i^*$ for every $i = 1, \dots, \ell$.

Definition 2. For a value $\delta \in (0, 1)$, a HIB-LTDF is (ω, δ) -**partially lossy** if it admits a sibling for which no PPT adversary $\mathcal{A}$ has non-negligible advantage in the following experiment where, depending on some secret bit $\beta \in \{0, 1\}$, the challenger plays either game **REAL** (when $\beta = 0$) or game **LOSSY** (when $\beta = 1$). Some instructions depend on whether $\mathcal{A}$ is a selective or an adaptive adversary.

0. The challenger generates global parameters $\text{pms} \leftarrow \text{HF.Setup}(\lambda)$ which are given to $\mathcal{A}$ who chooses an identity $\text{id}^\dagger = (\text{id}_1^\dagger, \dots, \text{id}_{\ell^\dagger}^\dagger)$, for some $\ell^\dagger \leq d$.
1. If the challenger plays the game **REAL** (i.e., if $\beta = 0$), the challenger runs $(\text{mpk}, \text{msk}) \leftarrow \text{HF.MKg}(\text{pms})$. Otherwise, the challenger is playing the **LOSSY** game and runs $(\text{mpk}, \text{msk}) \leftarrow \text{LHF.MKg}(\text{pms}, \text{id}^\dagger)$. The adversary $\mathcal{A}$ receives mpk in both cases and a list $IS \leftarrow \emptyset$ is initialized.
2. $\mathcal{B}$ makes secret key queries for hierarchical identities $\text{id} = (\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_\ell)$. The challenger responds as follows: a) upon a **Create-key** query, if $\beta = 0$, the challenger generates a private key as per $\text{SK}_{(\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_\ell)} \leftarrow \text{HF.Kg}(\text{pms}, \text{msk}, (\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_\ell))$ and if $\beta = 1$, it generates instead $\text{SK}_{(\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_\ell)} \leftarrow \text{LHF.Kg}(\text{pms}, \text{msk}, (\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_\ell))$; b) upon a **Create-delegated-key** query, the challenger simply runs the delegation algorithm HF.Del on input some secret key previously created at the request of $\mathcal{A}$; c) upon a **Reveal-key** query, the challenger returns $\perp$ if no key was previously created for the queried identity $\text{id} = (\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_\ell)$ and otherwise, the queried key $\text{SK}_{(\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_\ell)}$ is returned to $\mathcal{A}$ and the list IS is updated as $IS = IS \cup \{\text{id}\}$.
3. The adversary $\mathcal{A}$ outputs a hierarchical identity $\text{id}^* = (\text{id}_1^*, \dots, \text{id}_{\ell^*}^*)$ and a bit $d' \in \{0, 1\}$. In the selective setting, we impose $\ell^* = \ell^\dagger$ and $\text{id}_j^* = \text{id}_j^\dagger$ for each $j \in \{1, \dots, \ell^*\}$. In the adaptive case, we require that nor id^* nor any of its prefixes was the input of a “Reveal-key” query.
4. The final output the experiment is defined as follows. If $\beta = 0$, the experiment simply returns $d_{\text{REAL}}^{(\text{HF}, \mathcal{A})} = d'$. If $\beta = 1$, the experiment returns $d_{\text{LOSSY}}^{(\text{HF}, \mathcal{A})} = 1$ if the conjunction of events

$$(d' = 1) \wedge \left(\lambda \left(\text{HF.Eval}(\text{pms}, \text{mpk}, (\text{id}_1^*, \dots, \text{id}_{\ell^*}^*), \cdot) \right) \geq \omega \right)$$

is true. Otherwise, the experiment returns $d_{\text{LOSSY}}^{(\text{HF}, \mathcal{A})} = 0$.

As in [7], $\mathcal{A}$'s advantage is

$$\text{Adv}_\omega^{\delta\text{-lossy}}(\mathcal{A}) = \delta \cdot \Pr[d_{\text{REAL}}^{(\text{HF}, \mathcal{A})} = 1] - \Pr[d_{\text{LOSSY}}^{(\text{HF}, \mathcal{A})} = 1].$$

Observe that, given that $d_{\text{REAL}}^{(\text{HF}, \mathcal{A})}$ is only defined in game REAL (*i.e.*, when $\beta = 0$), we have $\Pr[d_{\text{REAL}}^{(\text{HF}, \mathcal{A})} = 1] = \Pr[d_{\text{REAL}}^{(\text{HF}, \mathcal{A})} = 1 | \beta = 0]$ and the same holds with $d_{\text{LOSSY}}^{(\text{HF}, \mathcal{A})}$.

3 A Selectively Secure Weakly Attribute-Hiding Hierarchical Predicate Encryption Scheme

We propose here a new hierarchical predicate encryption (HPE) scheme which considers inner-product predicates, and which will be used as a key ingredient in the design of our HIB-LTDF, in Section 4. For simplicity, we assume that vectors of attributes are all of the same length $\mu \in \mathbb{N}$ at each level.

The construction is inspired from the Shi-Waters delegatable predicate encryption scheme [27]. However, we have to turn it into a predicate encryption scheme for inner product relations (like the one of Okamoto and Takashima [24]) instead of a hidden vector encryption [9]. Another difficulty to solve is that we cannot use composite order groups as in [27] because, in our HIB-LTDF of Section 4, one of the subgroups would leak information on the input in lossy mode (this is actually what happened with our initial attempt). For this reason, we chose to work with prime-order groups and used asymmetric pairing configurations to anonymize ciphertexts. As a benefit, we obtain a better efficiency than by using the techniques of [9] by reducing the number of pairing evaluations.

Setup(λ, μ): given $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$ and the desired length μ of the attribute vectors at each level, choose asymmetric bilinear groups $(\mathbb{G}, \hat{\mathbb{G}}, \mathbb{G}_T)$ of order p , where $p > 2^\lambda$. Choose $g \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{G}$, $\hat{g} \xleftarrow{R} \hat{\mathbb{G}}$. Then, pick $\alpha, \alpha_v, \alpha_w \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$ and set $v = g^{\alpha_v}$, $\hat{v} = \hat{g}^{\alpha_v}$, $w = g^{\alpha_w}$ and $\hat{w} = \hat{g}^{\alpha_w}$. For $i_1 = 1, \dots, d$ and $i_2 = 0, \dots, \mu$, choose $\alpha_{i_1, i_2} \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$ and compute $h_{i_1, i_2} = g^{\alpha_{i_1, i_2}} \in \mathbb{G}$ and $\hat{h}_{i_1, i_2} = \hat{g}^{\alpha_{i_1, i_2}} \in \hat{\mathbb{G}}$. The master public key is defined to be

$$\text{mpk} := \left(v, w, e(g, \hat{v})^\alpha, \{h_{i_1, i_2}\}_{i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}, i_2 \in \{0, \dots, \mu\}} \right)$$

while the master secret key is $\text{msk} := (\hat{g}, \hat{g}^\alpha, \hat{v}, \hat{w}, \{\hat{h}_{i_1, i_2}\}_{i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}, i_2 \in \{0, \dots, \mu\}})$.

Keygen($\text{msk}, (\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)$): to generate a private key for vectors $(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)$ with $\ell \leq d$, parse msk as $(\hat{g}, \hat{v}, \hat{w}, \{\hat{h}_{i_1, i_2}\}_{i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}, i_2 \in \{0, \dots, \mu\}})$. For $i_1 = 1$ to ℓ , parse $\vec{X}_{i_1}$ as $(x_{i_1, 1}, \dots, x_{i_1, \mu}) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\mu$. Choose $r_w \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$ and $r_1, \dots, r_\ell \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$, for $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$. Then, compute the decryption component $SK_D = (D, D_w, \{D_{i_1}\}_{i_1=1}^\ell)$ of the key as

$$D = \hat{g}^\alpha \cdot \prod_{i_1=1}^\ell \left(\prod_{i_2=1}^\mu \hat{h}_{i_1, i_2}^{x_{i_1, i_2}} \right)^{r_{i_1}} \cdot \hat{w}^{r_w}, \quad D_w = \hat{v}^{r_w}, \quad D_{i_1} = \hat{v}^{r_{i_1}}.$$

To define the elements of its delegation component SK_{DL}

$$\left(\{K_{j,k}\}_{j \in \{\ell+1, \dots, d\}, k \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}}, \{L_j\}_{j=\ell+1}^d, \{L_{j,k,i_1}\}_{j \in \{\ell+1, \dots, d\}, k \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}, i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}}, \right. \\ \left. \{L_{w,j,k}\}_{j \in \{\ell+1, \dots, d\}, k \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}} \right)$$

pick $s_j \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$, $s_{j,k,i_1} \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$, $s_{w,j,k} \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$ for $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$, $i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$ and set:

$$K_{j,k} = \prod_{i_1=1}^\ell \left(\prod_{i_2=1}^\mu \hat{h}_{i_1, i_2}^{x_{i_1, i_2}} \right)^{s_{j,k,i_1}} \cdot \hat{h}_{j,k}^{s_j} \cdot \hat{w}^{s_{w,j,k}},$$

$$L_j = \hat{v}^{s_j} \quad L_{j,k,i_1} = \hat{v}^{s_{j,k,i_1}} \quad L_{w,j,k} = \hat{v}^{s_{w,j,k}}.$$

Output the private key $SK_{(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)} = (SK_D, SK_{DL})$.

Delegate(mpk, $(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)$, $SK_{(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)}$, $\vec{X}_{\ell+1}$): parse the key $SK_{(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)}$ as (SK_D, SK_{DL}) . Given, $\vec{X}_{\ell+1} = (x_{\ell+1,1}, \dots, x_{\ell+1,\mu}) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\mu$, do the following.

1. Randomize SK_{DL} by raising all its component to some $z \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$. Call this new key $\widehat{SK}_{DL}$ and write its elements with a hat (e.g., $\widehat{K}_{j,k} = K_{j,k}^z$).
2. Compute a *partial decryption key*

$$K_{\ell+1} = \prod_{k=1}^{\mu} \widehat{K}_{\ell+1,k}^{x_{\ell+1,k}} = \prod_{i_1=1}^{\ell} \left(\prod_{i_2=1}^{\mu} \widehat{h}_{i_1,i_2}^{x_{i_1,i_2}} \right)^{s_{\ell+1,i_1}} \cdot \left(\prod_{k=1}^{\mu} \widehat{h}_{\ell+1,k}^{x_{\ell+1,k}} \right)^{s_{\ell+1}} \cdot \widehat{w}^{s_{w,\ell+1}},$$

$$L_{\ell+1,i_1} = \prod_{k=1}^{\mu} \widehat{L}_{\ell+1,k,i_1}^{x_{\ell+1,k}} = \widehat{v}^{s_{\ell+1,i_1}} \quad \text{for } i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$$

$$L_{\ell+1,\ell+1} = \widehat{L}_{\ell+1} \quad L_{w,\ell+1} = \prod_{k=1}^{\mu} \widehat{L}_{w,\ell+1,k}^{x_{\ell+1,k}} = \widehat{v}^{s_{w,\ell+1}},$$

where we define the exponents $s_{\ell+1,i_1} = z \cdot \sum_{k=1}^{\mu} s_{\ell+1,k,i_1} \cdot x_{\ell+1,k}$ for $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$, and $s_{w,\ell+1} = z \cdot \sum_{k=1}^{\mu} s_{w,\ell+1,k} \cdot x_{\ell+1,k}$.

3. For all $j \in \{\ell+2, \dots, d\}$, $k \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$, compute re-randomized versions of the partial decryption key by raising the partial decryption key to a random power $\tau_{j,k} \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$.

$$K_{\ell+1}^{(j,k)} = K_{\ell+1}^{\tau_{j,k}}, \quad L_{w,\ell+1}^{(j,k)} = L_{w,\ell+1}^{\tau_{j,k}}, \quad \{L_{\ell+1,i_1}^{(j,k)} = L_{\ell+1,i_1}^{\tau_{j,k}}\}_{i_1=1}^{\ell+1}.$$

These values will be used to compute the delegation component of the new key at step 5.

4. Compute a decryption component $SK'_D = (D', D'_w, \{D'_{i_1}\}_{i_1=1}^{\ell+1})$ for the delegated key by setting $D' = D \cdot K_{\ell+1}$, $D'_w = D_w \cdot L_{w,\ell+1}$. Then, define $D'_{\ell+1} = L_{\ell+1,\ell+1}$ and, for each $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$, set $D'_{i_1} = D_{i_1} \cdot L_{\ell+1,i_1}$.
5. Compute a delegation component for the delegated key. For each $j \in \{\ell+2, \dots, d\}$, set $L'_j = \widehat{L}_j$. Then, for $k = 1$ to μ and $i_1 = 1$ to $\ell+1$, set

$$K'_{j,k} = \widehat{K}_{j,k} \cdot K_{\ell+1}^{(j,k)}, \quad L'_{w,j,k} = \widehat{L}_{w,j,k} \cdot L_{w,\ell+1}^{(j,k)} \quad L'_{j,k,i_1} = \widehat{L}_{j,k,i_1} \cdot L_{\ell+1,i_1}^{(j,k)},$$

where $\widehat{L}_{j,k,\ell+1} = 1$ for all j, k . The new delegation component SK'_{DL} is

$$\left(\{K'_{j,k}\}_{j \in \{\ell+2, \dots, d\}, k \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}}, \{L'_j\}_{j=\ell+2}^d, \right. \\ \left. \{L'_{j,k,i_1}\}_{j \in \{\ell+2, \dots, d\}, k \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}, i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}}, \{L'_{w,j,k}\}_{j \in \{\ell+2, \dots, d\}, k \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}} \right)$$

Return the delegated private key $SK_{(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_{\ell+1})} = (SK'_D, SK'_{DL})$.

Encrypt($\text{mpk}, (\vec{Y}_1, \dots, \vec{Y}_\kappa), M$): given a plaintext $M \in \mathbb{G}_T$ and vectors $\vec{Y}_1 = (y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{1,\mu}), \dots, \vec{Y}_\kappa = (y_{\kappa,1}, \dots, y_{\kappa,\mu})$, choose $s \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$ and compute

$$C_0 = M \cdot e(g, \hat{v})^{\alpha \cdot s}, \quad C_v = v^s, \quad C_w = w^s,$$

$$\{C_{i_1, i_2} = (h_{i_1, 0}^{y_{i_1, i_2}} \cdot h_{i_1, i_2})^s\}_{i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \kappa\}, i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}},$$

The ciphertext is $C = (C_0, C_v, C_w, \{C_{i_1, i_2}\}_{i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \kappa\}, i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}})$.

Decrypt($\text{mpk}, (\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell), SK_{(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)}, C$): parse the private key $SK_{(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)}$ as (SK_D, SK_{DL}) , where $SK_D = (D, D_w, \{D_{i_1}\}_{i_1=1}^\ell)$ and the ciphertext C as $(C_0, C_v, C_w, \{C_{i_1, i_2}\}_{i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \kappa\}, i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}})$. Then, do the following.

1. For each index $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$, compute the product $C_{i_1} = \prod_{i_2=1}^\mu C_{i_1, i_2}^{x_{i_1, i_2}}$ which equals $C_{2, i} = (h_{i_1, 0}^{\vec{X}_{i_1} \cdot \vec{Y}_{i_1}} \cdot \prod_{i_2=1}^\mu h_{i_1, i_2}^{x_{i_1, i_2}})^s$.
2. Return M if $M = C_0 \cdot e(C_v, D)^{-1} \cdot e(C_w, D_w) \cdot \prod_{i_1=1}^\ell e(C_{i_1}, D_{i_1})$ is in the appropriate subspace⁴ of $\mathbb{G}_T$. Otherwise, return $\perp$.

Our HIB-LTDF uses the predicate-only variant of the above scheme. This variant is obtained by discarding the ciphertext component C_0 (which contains the payload) and the factor $\hat{g}^\alpha$ from the private key component D .

Although the scheme is only proved secure in the sense of a relatively weak definition (see next section), we believe it is of interest in its own right as it seems to be the fastest known hierarchical predicate encryption system. Indeed, the number of pairing evaluations only depends on the depth ℓ of the predicate $(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)$ encoded in the private key and not on the dimension n of vectors at each level. This appears to be a unique feature among all known such systems: previous constructions cost $O(\ell \cdot n)$ pairing evaluations to decrypt. It would be interesting to see if a similarly efficient scheme can be proved fully secure.

3.1 Analysis of the New HPE Scheme

Let us prove now that our hierarchical predicate encryption scheme is both correct and selectively weakly attribute-hiding.

Correctness

Lemma 1. *The scheme given in Section 3 is correct. This is, for any plaintext M and any vectors $\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell, \vec{Y}_1, \dots, \vec{Y}_\kappa$,*

$$\text{Decrypt}(\text{mpk}, (\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell), SK_{(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)}, \text{Encrypt}(\text{mpk}, (\vec{Y}_1, \dots, \vec{Y}_\kappa), M)) = M$$

whenever $f_{(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)}(\vec{Y}_1, \dots, \vec{Y}_\kappa) = 1$. This fact does not depend on whether the key $SK_{(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)}$ was created using the Delegate or the Keygen algorithm.

⁴ As in [9,21], the plaintext space is restricted to have a size much smaller than $|\mathbb{G}_T|$ to make sure that the decryption algorithm returns $\perp$ if an unauthorized key is used to decrypt.

Proof. Let $SK_{(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)} = (SK_D, SK_{DL})$ be the output of running the key generation protocol $\text{Keygen}(\text{msk}, (\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell))$, where each attribute vector is $\vec{X}_{i_1} = (x_{i_1,1}, \dots, x_{i_1,\mu}) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\mu$, for each $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$. Let us write the decryption component of the key as $SK_D = (D, D_w, \{D_{i_1}\}_{i_1=1}^\ell)$.

Let $C = (C_0, C_v, C_w, \{C_{i_1, i_2}\}_{i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \kappa\}, i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}})$ be the output of the encryption algorithm $\text{Encrypt}(\text{mpk}, (\vec{Y}_1, \dots, \vec{Y}_\kappa), M)$, for vectors $\vec{Y}_1 = (y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{1,\mu}), \dots, \vec{Y}_\kappa = (y_{\kappa,1}, \dots, y_{\kappa,\mu})$.

Since $f_{(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)}(\vec{Y}_1, \dots, \vec{Y}_\kappa) = 1$, and by the definition of hierarchical inner-product predicates, we know that $\ell \leq \kappa$ and $\vec{X}_i \cdot \vec{Y}_i = 0$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$. Therefore, when the decryption protocol $\text{Decrypt}(\text{mpk}, (\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell), SK_{(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)}, C)$ computes C_{i_1} , for each $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$, the obtained value equals $C_{i_1} = (\prod_{i_2=1}^\mu h_{i_1, i_2}^{x_{i_1, i_2}})^s$. The decryption protocol computes then the pairing of this element C_{i_1} with $D_{i_1} = \hat{v}^{r_{i_1}}$. Multiplying all these pairings, for indices $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$, one obtains $e(v^s, \prod_{i_1=1}^\ell (\prod_{i_2=1}^\mu \hat{h}_{i_1, i_2}^{x_{i_1, i_2}})^{r_{i_1}})$. This value is cancelled out with one of the factors of $e(C_v, D)$, when computing the final decryption operation $C_0 \cdot e(C_v, D)^{-1} \cdot e(C_w, D_w) \cdot \prod_{i_1=1}^\ell e(C_{i_1}, D_{i_1})$. The other two factors of $e(C_v, D)$ are $e(v^s, \hat{g}^\alpha)$ and $e(v^s, \hat{w}^{r_w})$, which cancel out the factor $e(g, \hat{v})^{\alpha s}$, contained in $C_0 = M \cdot e(g, \hat{v})^{\alpha s}$, and the factor $e(C_w, D_w) = e(w^s, \hat{v}^{r_w})$, respectively. Therefore, the final computation of the decryption protocol results in the plaintext M contained in C_0 .

In this way, we have proved that the encryption and decryption protocols work correctly when the original secret keys (resulting from Keygen) are used. The fact that the decryption protocol works fine also with delegated secret keys (resulting from Delegate) is a consequence of Lemma 2, inside the proof of Theorem 1 below. If a delegated secret key could lead to an incorrect decryption, then this fact could be used to distinguish original secret keys from delegated ones, which would contradict the statement of Lemma 2. $\square$

Attribute-Hiding Property

The new hierarchical predicate encryption scheme is selectively weakly attribute-hiding under the BDH, $\mathcal{P}$ -BDH₁ and DDH₂ assumptions, as proved below. We want to stress that the security of its predicate-only variant (which is the one used as a key ingredient in the design of our HIB-LTDF) relies only on the latter two assumptions.

Theorem 1. *The scheme given in Section 3 is selectively weakly attribute-hiding if the BDH, $\mathcal{P}$ -BDH₁ and DDH₂ assumptions hold in $(\mathbb{G}, \hat{\mathbb{G}}, \mathbb{G}_T)$.*

The proof considers a sequence of games starting with the real game and ending with a game where the adversary has no advantage and wins with probability exactly 1/2.

For each i , we denote by S_i the event that the adversary wins in Game_i . In the whole sequence of games, we call d^* the depth of the challenge hierarchical vectors $(\vec{Y}_1^0, \dots, \vec{Y}_{d^*}^0)$ and $(\vec{Y}_1^1, \dots, \vec{Y}_{d^*}^1)$ and

$$C^* = (C_0^*, C_v^*, C_w^*, \{C_{i_1, i_2}^*\}_{i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d^*\}, i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}})$$

denotes the challenge ciphertext.

Game₀: is the real attack game at the end of which the challenger outputs 1 in the event, called S_0 , that the adversary $\mathcal{A}$ manages to output $\beta' \in \{0, 1\}$ such that $\beta' = \beta$, where $\beta \in \{0, 1\}$ is the challenger's hidden bit in the challenge phase. If $\beta' \neq \beta$, the challenger outputs 0.

Game₁: is identical to Game_0 with the difference that the challenger always answers private key queries by returning fresh private keys (*i.e.*, keys produced by **Keygen**) instead of deriving those keys using the delegation algorithm.

Game₂: is like Game₁ but the challenge ciphertext C^* is now an encryption under $(\vec{Y}_1^\beta, \dots, \vec{Y}_{d^*}^\beta)$ of a random plaintext $M \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{G}_T$, which is chosen independently of M_0 and M_1 .

Game₃: is identical to Game₂ with the difference that, in the challenge ciphertext, C_w^* is replaced by a random group element chosen uniformly and independently in $\mathbb{G}$.

Game_{4,i,j} ($1 \leq i \leq d^*$, $1 \leq j \leq \mu$): is identical to Game 3 with the difference that, in the challenge ciphertext, C_{i_1, i_2}^* are replaced by random elements of $\mathbb{G}$ if $i_1 < i$ or $(i = i_1) \wedge (i_2 \leq j)$. Other group elements (*i.e.*, for which $i > i_1$ or $(i = i_1) \wedge (i_2 > j)$) are still computed as in a normal challenge ciphertext.

In Game_{4,d^*,\mu}, it is easy to see that the adversary $\mathcal{A}$ cannot guess $\beta \in \{0, 1\}$ with higher probability than $\Pr[S_{4,d^*,\mu}] = 1/2$ since the challenge ciphertext C^* is completely independent of $\beta \in \{0, 1\}$. $\square$

Lemma 2. *Game₀ and Game₁ are computationally indistinguishable if the DDH₂ assumption holds in $(\mathbb{G}, \hat{\mathbb{G}})$.*

Proof. The lemma will be proved by a hybrid argument. We define Game_{0,i} for all $0 \leq i \leq q$. Game_{0,i} differs from Game₀ in the fact that, when the adversary issues the first i delegation queries, instead of generating the delegated keys faithfully using the Delegate algorithm, the challenger calls the Keygen algorithm to generate these delegated keys. For all the remaining queries, the challenger computes keys and responds faithfully as in Game₀. Under the above definition, Game_{0,0} is the same as Game₀ and Game_{0,q} is the same as Game₁. We will prove that Game_{0,\kappa} is indistinguishable from Game_{0,\kappa+1} for all $0 \leq \kappa \leq q - 1$. To this end, we will proceed similarly to [27] and rely on a generalized version (called GDDH hereafter) of the DDH problem in $\hat{\mathbb{G}}$.

Given a group generator GG , define the following distribution $P(\lambda)$:

$$\begin{aligned} & (p, (\mathbb{G}, \hat{\mathbb{G}}, \mathbb{G}_T), e) \xleftarrow{R} \text{GG}(\lambda, 1), \\ & g \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{G}, \quad \hat{g} \xleftarrow{R} \hat{\mathbb{G}}, \\ & \hat{h}_1, \hat{h}_2, \dots, \hat{h}_\ell \xleftarrow{R} \hat{\mathbb{G}} \\ & \tau \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p \\ & X \leftarrow ((p, (\mathbb{G}, \hat{\mathbb{G}}, \mathbb{G}_T), e), g, \hat{g}, \hat{h}_1, \hat{h}_2, \dots, \hat{h}_\ell) \\ & Q \leftarrow (\hat{h}_1^\tau, \hat{h}_2^\tau, \dots, \hat{h}_\ell^\tau), \\ & \text{Output } (X, Q) \end{aligned}$$

For an algorithm $\mathcal{A}$, define $\mathcal{A}$'s advantage in solving the above problem:

$$\ell\text{-GDDH } \text{Adv}_{\text{GG}, \mathcal{A}}(\lambda) := |\Pr[\mathcal{A}(X, Q) = 1] - \Pr[\mathcal{A}(X, R)]|$$

where $(X, Q) \leftarrow P(\lambda)$ and $R \leftarrow \hat{\mathbb{G}}^\ell$. It is immediate⁵ that GDDH is not easier than DDH₂ and that the latter advantage function is negligible if the DDH₂ assumption holds in $(\mathbb{G}, \hat{\mathbb{G}})$.

To prove that Game_{0,\kappa} is indistinguishable from Game_{0,\kappa+1} we will use another hybrid argument. We define Game'_{0,\kappa}, which differs from Game_{0,\kappa} in that, for the $(\kappa + 1)$ -th delegation query, $\widehat{SK}_{DL}$

⁵ The straightforward reduction computes a GDDH instance from a DDH₂ instance $(g, \hat{g}, \hat{g}^a, \hat{g}^b, \hat{\eta} \stackrel{?}{=} \hat{g}^{ab})$ by setting $\hat{h}_i = \hat{g}^{\alpha_i} \cdot (\hat{g}^b)^{\beta_i}$ and $Q_i = (\hat{g}^a)^{\alpha_i} \cdot \hat{\eta}^{\beta_i}$ for $i = 1$ to ℓ with $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p$, $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_\ell \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p$. If $\hat{\eta} = \hat{g}^{ab}$, we have $Q = (\hat{h}_1^a, \dots, \hat{h}_\ell^a)$ whereas, if $\eta \in_R \hat{\mathbb{G}}$, Q is a random vector of $\hat{\mathbb{G}}^\ell$.

is the delegation component of a fresh key, instead of a delegation component obtained by raising every element in SK_{DL} to the same random power $z \in_R \mathbb{Z}_p$. We show that a PPT adversary cannot distinguish between the two games.

We also define $\text{Game}_{0,\kappa}''$, which differs from $\text{Game}_{0,\kappa}'$ in that, for the $(\kappa + 1)$ -th delegation query, instead of re-randomizing the components of the partial decryption key with the same exponent $\tau_{j,k}$, $\{L_{\ell+1,i_1}^{(j,k)}\}_{i_1=1}^{\ell+1}, L_{w,\ell+1}^{(j,k)}$ are randomized with different independently chosen exponents, while $K'_{j,k}$ is chosen in such a way that the resulting key is still valid. We also prove that no PPT adversary can notice the difference.

We will argue that $\text{Game}_{0,\kappa}'' = \text{Game}_{0,\kappa+1}$. Indeed, in the first step, we change $\widehat{SK}_{DL}$ so that, in step 2 of the Delegate algorithm, we obtain a randomized decryption key (except for the g^α term). When multiplied by SK_D , it gives a randomized decryption key for $(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_{\ell+1})$. On the other hand, in step 2 of the hybrid proof we change the partial decryption keys so that they also are randomized keys except the g^α term.

Claim. $\text{Game}_{0,\kappa}$ is computationally indistinguishable from $\text{Game}_{0,\kappa}'$.

Proof. Let q_0 denote the maximum number of secret key queries (taking into account both the “Create-key” and “Create-delegated-key” queries) made by the adversary. We build a simulator $\mathcal{B}$ that uses $\mathcal{A}$ to break the following $(q_0 d \mu(d+1))$ -GDDH assumption.

$$\begin{aligned} (p, \mathbb{G}, \hat{\mathbb{G}}, \mathbb{G}_T, e) &\xleftarrow{R} \text{GG}(\lambda, 1), \\ g &\xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{G}, \quad \hat{g} \xleftarrow{R} \hat{\mathbb{G}} \\ \{\hat{v}_{i,i_1,i_2,k} &\leftarrow \hat{\mathbb{G}}\}_{i \in \{1, \dots, q_0\}, i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}, i_2 \in \{0, \dots, \mu\}, k \in \{1, \dots, d+1\}} \\ \tau &\xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p \\ X &\leftarrow ((p, \mathbb{G}, \hat{\mathbb{G}}, \mathbb{G}_T, e), g, \hat{g}, \{\hat{v}_{i,i_1,i_2,k}\}_{i \in \{1, \dots, q_0\}, i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}, i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}, k \in \{1, \dots, d+1\}}) \\ Q &\leftarrow (\{\hat{v}_{i,i_1,i_2,k}^\tau\}_{i \in \{1, \dots, q_0\}, i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}, i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}, k \in \{1, \dots, d+1\}}) \end{aligned}$$

Then, the challenger randomly decides to give $(X, Q' = Q)$ or $(X, Q' = R)$, where R is a random vector of elements in $\hat{\mathbb{G}}$ of the size of Q . The simulator will use $\mathcal{A}$ as a subroutine to break the above problem.

Init and Setup. At the beginning of the security game, the adversary commits to two hierarchical vectors $(\vec{Y}_1^0, \dots, \vec{Y}_{d^*}^0)$ and $(\vec{Y}_1^1, \dots, \vec{Y}_{d^*}^1)$, where $d^* \leq d$. The simulator chooses the public and the secret key as usual according to the Setup algorithm. Let $c = \log_v(w)$ and $a_{i_1,i_2} = \log_v(h_{i_1,i_2})$. Note that these values are known to the simulator since they are easily computable from msk .

Secret key queries. We distinguish three cases:

- When a “create-key” query or one of the first κ delegated secret key queries is made, the simulator computes and saves a private key, which is given to $\mathcal{A}$ when a “reveal-key” query is made. To compute this secret key, the simulator uses the elements from the GDDH instance, in such a way that the exponents are distributed at random. In particular, if it is the i -th query, the simulator defines the components of the decryption component of the key as:

$$\begin{aligned} D &= g^\alpha \prod_{i_1=1}^{\ell} D_{i_1}^{(\sum_{i_2=1}^{\mu} a_{i_1,i_2} x_{i_1,i_2})} \cdot D_w^c, \quad D_w = \hat{v}_{i,0,1,d+1}, \\ D_{i_1} &= \hat{v}_{i,0,1,i_1} \quad i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}. \end{aligned}$$

For the delegation component of the key, for all $j \in \{\ell+1 \dots d\}$, all $k \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$, the simulator lets:

$$L_j = \hat{v}_{i,j,1,\ell+1}, \quad L_{j,k,i_1} = \hat{v}_{i,j,k,i_1} \quad i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}, \quad L_{w,j,k} = \hat{v}_{i,j,k,d+1}.$$

As the simulator knows the discrete logarithms $c = \log_{\hat{v}}(\hat{w})$ and $a_{i_1,i_2} = \log_{\hat{v}}(\hat{h}_{i_1,i_2})$, for each $j \in \{\ell+1, \dots, d\}$ and all $k \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$, it can compute the remaining components of the key as follows:

$$K_{j,k} = \prod_{i_1=1}^{\ell} L_{j,k,i_1}^{(\sum_{i_2=1}^k a_{i_1,i_2} \cdot x_{i_1,i_2})} \cdot L_j^{a_{j,k}} \cdot L_{w,j,k}^c. \quad (1)$$

- When the adversary makes the $(\kappa+1)$ -th delegation query, it specifies a parent key and asks to fix the level of the hierarchy to some vector $\vec{X}_{\ell+1}$. In particular, assume that the parent key was created in the i -th query. When performing Step 1 of the Delegate algorithm, for all $j \in \{\ell+2, \dots, d\}$, $k \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$, the simulator sets

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{L}_j &= Q'_{i,j,1,\ell+1}, \\ \hat{L}_{j,k,i_1} &= Q'_{i,j,k,i_1} \quad i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}, \\ \hat{L}_{w,j,k} &= Q'_{i,j,k,d+1} \end{aligned}$$

and computes $K_{j,k}$, for each $j \in \{\ell+2, \dots, d\}$, $k \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$ exactly in the same way as in expression (1).

- For all the remaining queries, the simulator responds faithfully as in the real game.

Clearly, if $Q' = Q$ in the GDDH instance, then the above simulation is identical to $\text{Game}_{0,\kappa}$. Otherwise, it is identical to $\text{Game}'_{0,\kappa}$ since, in the $(\kappa+1)$ -th delegation query, $Q = R$ implicitly defines a set of fresh random values for $s_j, s_{j,k,i_1}, s_{w,j,k}$, for the appropriate values of j, k, i_1 .

Challenge The simulator generates the challenge ciphertext as normal.

Guess If the adversary has a difference of ϵ in its advantage in $\text{Game}_{0,\kappa}$ and $\text{Game}'_{0,\kappa}$, the simulator has a comparable advantage in solving the GDDH instance. $\square$

Claim. $\text{Game}'_{0,\kappa}$ is computationally indistinguishable from $\text{Game}''_{0,\kappa}$.

Proof. To prove this claim, we will appeal to a nested hybrid argument. Let $\text{Game}'_{0,\kappa,0,0} = \text{Game}'_{0,\kappa}$, and for $1 \leq \eta \leq (d-\ell-1)$, $1 \leq \nu \leq \mu$, define $\text{Game}'_{0,\kappa,\eta,\nu}$ as the game that differs from $\text{Game}'_{0,\kappa}$ in the following: in the step of the delegation algorithm where the components $\{L_{\ell+1,i_1}^{(j,k)}\}_{i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell+1\}}, L_{w,\ell+1}^{(j,k)}$ are created by re-randomizing the partial decryption key with some exponent $\tau_{j,k}$, we re-randomize instead each of these components with a different exponent chosen uniformly and independently at random whenever $(j,k) \leq (\eta + \ell + 1, \nu)$ (in lexicographic order). Observe that, by definition, $\text{Game}'_{0,\kappa,d-\ell-1,\mu} = \text{Game}''_{0,\kappa}$. We will show that an adversary cannot distinguish between one game and the next. That is, if we define and $\text{Game}'_{0,\kappa,\eta,\mu+1} = \text{Game}'_{0,\kappa,\eta+1,0}$ to simplify the notation, what we will show is that no polynomial time adversary can distinguish between $\text{Game}'_{0,\kappa,\eta,\nu}$ and $\text{Game}'_{0,\kappa,\eta,\nu+1}$.

The simulator tries to solve the following $(\mu(d+1))$ -GDDH instance.

$$\begin{aligned}
& (p, \mathbb{G}, \hat{\mathbb{G}}, \mathbb{G}_T, e) \xleftarrow{R} \text{GG}(\lambda, 1), \\
& g \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{G}, \hat{g} \xleftarrow{R} \hat{\mathbb{G}} \\
& \{\hat{v}_{i,k} \leftarrow \hat{\mathbb{G}}\}_{i \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}, k \in \{1, \dots, d+1\}} \\
& \tau \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p \\
& X \leftarrow ((n, \mathbb{G}, \hat{\mathbb{G}}, \mathbb{G}_T, e), g, \hat{g}, \{\hat{v}_{i,k}\}_{i \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}, k \in \{1, \dots, d+1\}}) \\
& Q \leftarrow (\{\hat{v}_{i,k}^\tau\}_{i \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}, k \in \{1, \dots, d+1\}})
\end{aligned}$$

The simulator tries to distinguish between $(X, Q' = Q)$ and $(X, Q' = R)$ where R is a random vector from $\hat{\mathbb{G}}$. The simulator uses as a subroutine an adversary $\mathcal{A}$ who can distinguish between $\text{Game}'_{0,\kappa,\eta,\nu}$ and $\text{Game}'_{0,\kappa,\eta,\nu+1}$.

The simulator runs the Setup algorithm as usual in such a way that it knows the discrete logarithms $c = \log_v(w) = \log_{\hat{v}}(\hat{w})$ and $a_{i_1 i_2} = \log_v(h_{i_1, i_2}) = \log_{\hat{v}}(\hat{h}_{i_1, i_2})$ for any $1 \leq i_1 \leq d$, $0 \leq i_2 \leq \mu$.

To answer secret key queries, the simulator proceeds as follows:

- For the first κ -th delegation queries and all of the “create-key” queries, the simulator computes the keys freshly at random.
- At the $(\kappa + 1)$ -th delegation query, the adversary specifies a parent key and requests to fix the $(\ell + 1)$ -th level of the hierarchy to $\vec{X}_{\ell+1}$. To answer this query, the simulator first generates some components of $\widehat{SK}_{DL}$ simply by choosing at random the values $\hat{L}_j, \hat{L}_{w,j,k}$ for all $j \in \{\ell + 2, \dots, d\}, k \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}, i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$. To compute the remaining components and the decryption key component, the simulator sets

$$\begin{aligned}
L_{\ell+1, i_1} &= \prod_{k=1}^{\mu} \hat{L}_{\ell+1, k, i_1}^{x_{\ell+1, k}} = \prod_{k=1}^{\mu} (\hat{v}_{k, i_1})^{x_{\ell+1, k}} & i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\} \\
L_{\ell+1, \ell+1} &= \hat{L}_{\ell+1} = \hat{v}_{1, \ell+1} \\
L_{w, \ell+1} &= \prod_{k=1}^{\mu} \hat{L}_{w, \ell+1, k}^{x_{\ell+1, k}} = \prod_{k=1}^{\mu} (\hat{v}_{k, d+1})^{x_{\ell+1, k}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the simulator knows the discrete logarithms $c = \log_{\hat{v}}(\hat{w})$ and $a_{i_1, i_2} = \log_{\hat{v}}(\hat{h}_{i_1, i_2})$, the remaining components of $\widehat{SK}_{DL}$ and those of the partial decryption key can be generated efficiently in the same way as in the proof of indistinguishability of $\text{Game}_{0,\kappa}$ and $\text{Game}'_{0,\kappa}$. In particular, the simulator can compute

$$K_{\ell+1} = \prod_{i_1=1}^{\ell} \prod_{i_2=1}^{\mu} L_{\ell+1, i_1}^{a_{i_1, i_2}} \cdot L_{\ell+1, \ell+1}^{\sum_{k=1}^{\mu} a_{\ell+1, k}} \cdot L_{w, \ell+1}^c.$$

To create $K_{\ell+1}^{(j,k)}, \{L_{\ell+1, i_1}^{(j,k)}\}_{i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell+1\}}, L_{w, \ell+1}^{(j,k)}$, if $(j, k) \leq (\eta + \ell + 1, \nu)$ (in lexicographic order), the values are chosen as fresh random delegation keys. For the $(\eta + \ell + 1, \nu + 1)$ partial decryption

key, the simulator lets

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\ell+1, i_1}^{(\eta+\ell+1, \nu+1)} &= \prod_{k=1}^{\mu} (Q'_{k, i_1})^{x_{\ell+1, k}} & i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\} \\ L_{\ell+1, \ell+1}^{(\eta+\ell+1, \nu+1)} &= Q'_{1, \ell+1} \\ L_{w, \ell+1}^{(\eta+\ell+1, \nu+1)} &= \prod_{k=1}^{\mu} (Q'_{k, d+1})^{x_{\ell+1, k}}. \end{aligned}$$

Again, as the simulator knows the discrete logarithm of $\hat{w}, \hat{h}_{i_1, i_2}$ w.r.t. the base $\hat{v}$, the remaining terms – including $K_{\ell+1}^{(\eta+\ell+1, \nu+1)}$ – can be generated efficiently. For the remaining partial decryption keys, the simulator generates them faithfully using the Delegate algorithm.

- The remaining delegated key queries are generated faithfully.

Clearly, if $Q' = Q$ in the GDDH instance, then the above simulation is identically distributed as $\text{Game}'_{0, \kappa, \eta, \nu}$, otherwise it is identically distributed as $\text{Game}'_{0, \kappa, \eta, \nu+1}$.

The simulator generates the challenge ciphertext as normal and sends it to the adversary. If the adversary has ϵ difference in its advantage in $\text{Game}'_{0, \kappa, \eta, \nu}$ and $\text{Game}'_{0, \kappa, \eta, \nu+1}$, it is not hard to see that the simulator has a comparable advantage in solving the GDDH instance. $\square$

Lemma 3. *Game₁ and Game₂ are computationally indistinguishable if the BDH assumption holds in $(\mathbb{G}, \hat{\mathbb{G}}, \mathbb{G}_T)$.*

Proof. Assume that there's an adversary $\mathcal{A}$ that can distinguish between Game₁ and Game₂. We build an adversary $\mathcal{B}$ that uses $\mathcal{A}$ as a subroutine to break the BDH assumption. The simulator $\mathcal{B}$ receives as input

$$(g, g^a, g^c, \hat{g}, \hat{g}^a, \hat{g}^b, Q'),$$

where Q' is either $e(g, \hat{g})^{abc}$ or an element chosen uniformly at random in $\mathbb{G}_T$.

The adversary $\mathcal{A}$ commits to two vectors $(\vec{Y}_1^0, \dots, \vec{Y}_{d^*}^0)$ and $(\vec{Y}_1^1, \dots, \vec{Y}_{d^*}^1)$. The challenger $\mathcal{B}$ picks $\beta \xleftarrow{R} \{0, 1\}$. If $d^* < d$, the simulator picks at random $d - d^*$ vectors $Y_{d^*+1}^\beta, \dots, Y_d^\beta \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\mu$. The simulator $\mathcal{B}$ runs the Setup algorithm as usual except that it implicitly sets α to be ab by defining $e(g, \hat{v})^\alpha = e(g^a, \hat{g}^b)^{\alpha_v}$, and then, for $i_1 = 1, \dots, d$ and $i_2 = 1, \dots, \mu$, it defines $h_{i_1, i_2} = (g^a)^{z_{i_1} y_{i_1, i_2}} g^{t_{i_1, i_2}}$ for $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, $i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$ and $h_{i_1, 0} = (g^a)^{-z_{i_1}}$, for some random exponents z_{i_1}, t_{i_1, i_2} . The values of $\hat{h}_{i_1, i_2}$ for $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, $i_2 \in \{0, \dots, \mu\}$ are defined similarly from the value $\hat{g}^a$ of the BDH instance. Observe that β remains hidden from $\mathcal{A}$ and that the parameters are correctly distributed.

For the secret key queries, in the last lemma we have just proven that delegated keys are indistinguishable from freshly generated ones. Therefore, $\mathcal{B}$ will generate the secret keys using algorithm Keygen when a reveal query is made. Note that α is defined as ab , which is not known to $\mathcal{B}$. However, $\mathcal{B}$ needs to simulate secret keys for $(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)$ as long as $f_{(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)}(\vec{Y}_1^\beta, \dots, \vec{Y}_{d^*}^\beta) = 0$. As α doesn't appear in the delegating component of the key, the delegation component of the secret keys SK_{DL} can be created using the parameters as usual. Therefore, from now on we focus on how to create the decryption component of the secret key. Denote by ℓ' the index of the smallest element of the vector $(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)$ for which $\vec{X}_{\ell'} \cdot \vec{Y}_{\ell'}^\beta \neq 0$. This value ℓ' always exists if $\ell \leq d^*$ by

hypothesis and exists with overwhelming probability if $\ell > d^*$, since the vectors $Y_{d^*+1}^\beta, \dots, Y_d^\beta \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\mu$ are completely hidden from $\mathcal{A}$'s view.

The simulator creates the decryption component of the secret key as follows:

$$D = \hat{g}^{ab} \prod_{i_1=1}^{\ell} \left(\prod_{i_2=1}^{\mu} \hat{h}_{i_1, i_2}^{x_{i_1, i_2}} \right)^{r_{i_1}} \hat{w}^{r_w}$$

where the term $\hat{g}^{ab} \left(\prod_{i_2=1}^{\mu} \hat{h}_{i_1, i_2}^{x_{i_1, i_2}} \right)^{r_{i_1}}$ is computed as

$$\left(\prod_{i_2=1}^{\mu} \hat{h}_{i_1, i_2}^{x_{i_1, i_2}} \right)^{\hat{r}_{i_1}} (\hat{g}^b)^{-(\sum_{i_2=1}^{\mu} x_{i_1, i_2} t_{i_1, i_2}) / (z_{i_1} \vec{X}_{i_1} \cdot \vec{Y}_{i_1}^\beta)},$$

while the other terms in the product are just computed as usual. It is not hard to see that, if we define $r_{i_1} = \hat{r}_{i_1} - b / (z_{i_1} \vec{X}_{i_1} \cdot \vec{Y}_{i_1}^\beta)$, then the computation is correct. All the other terms in the decryption component can be computed efficiently, since the simulator knows all the parameters needed and it also knows $\hat{g}^b$.

At the challenge step, the adversary $\mathcal{A}$ gives $\mathcal{B}$ two messages, M_0 and M_1 . $\mathcal{B}$ then computes

$$C_0 = M_\beta \cdot (Q')^{\alpha_v}, \quad C_v = (g^c)^{\alpha_v}, \quad C_w = (g^c)^{\alpha_w}, \\ \{C_{i_1, i_2} = (g^c)^{t_{i_1, i_2}}\}_{i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d^*\}, i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}}$$

It is not hard to check that the challenge ciphertext is correctly distributed.

Finally, when the adversary $\mathcal{A}$ outputs a guess β' , if $\beta = \beta'$, then $\mathcal{B}$ guesses that $Q' = e(g, \hat{g})^{abc}$ and if $\beta \neq \beta'$ guesses that $Q' = R$. If $\mathcal{A}$ has ϵ advantage in distinguishing between the two cases, then $\mathcal{B}$ also has ϵ advantage in solving the assumption G3DH instance, except in the case that $\mathcal{A}$ managed to output some secret key query for vector $(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)$ for which $\vec{X}_i \cdot \vec{Y}_i^\beta = 0$ for all $i = d^* + 1, \dots, d$ was zero for all $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, which occurs only with negligible probability.

Lemma 4. *Game₂ and Game₃ are computationally indistinguishable if the $\mathcal{P}$ -BDH₁ assumption holds in $(\mathbb{G}, \hat{\mathbb{G}})$.*

Proof. Assuming that the adversary $\mathcal{A}$ outputs $\beta' = \beta$ with noticeably different probabilities in Game₂ and Game₃, we build an distinguisher $\mathcal{B}$ for the $\mathcal{P}$ -BDH₁ assumption.

Namely, algorithm $\mathcal{B}$ receives as input a tuple

$$(g, g^b, g^{ab}, g^c, \hat{g}, \hat{g}^a, \hat{g}^b, g^z),$$

where $a, b, c \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p$. Its goal is to decide if $z = abc$ or $z \in_R \mathbb{Z}_p$.

To this end, $\mathcal{B}$ interacts with $\mathcal{A}$ as follows. It first receives the vectors $(\vec{Y}_0^0, \dots, \vec{Y}_{d^*}^0), (\vec{Y}_0^1, \dots, \vec{Y}_{d^*}^1)$, at some depth $d^* \leq d$, that $\mathcal{A}$ wishes to be challenged upon. We may assume w.l.o.g. that $\mathcal{B}$ chooses its challenge bit $\beta \xleftarrow{R} \{0, 1\}$ at the beginning of the game. Also, if $d^* < d$, for each $i \in \{d^* + 1, \dots, d\}$, $\mathcal{B}$ defines the vector $\vec{Y}_i^\beta$ as a random vector of $\mathbb{Z}_p^\mu$.

It defines the master public key by setting $e(g, \hat{v})^\alpha = e(g, \hat{g})^{\alpha \cdot \gamma_v}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} v &= g^{\gamma_v}, \\ h_{i_1, 0} &= (g^b)^{\gamma_{i_1, 0}} & i_1 &\in \{1, \dots, d\} \\ h_{i_1, i_2} &= (g^b)^{-\gamma_{i_1, 0} \cdot y_{i_1, i_2}^\beta} \cdot g^{\gamma_{i_1, i_2}} & i_1 &\in \{1, \dots, d\}, i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \mu\} \\ w &= g^y \cdot (g^{ab})^x, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $\alpha, \gamma_v, x, y \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p$ and $\gamma_{i_1, i_2} \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p$, for each $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, $i_2 \in \{0, \dots, \mu\}$. For each i_1 , we also define the vector $\vec{\gamma}_{i_1} = (\gamma_{i_1, 1}, \dots, \gamma_{i_1, \mu}) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\mu$. We observe that $\mathcal{B}$ does not know $\hat{w}$ (which depends on the unavailable term $\hat{g}^{ab}$) but *can* compute $\{\hat{h}_{i_1, i_2}\}_{i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}, i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}}$.

When the adversary $\mathcal{A}$ requests a key for a hierarchical vector $\mathbf{X} = (\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)$, $\mathcal{B}$ parses $\vec{X}_{i_1}$ as $(x_{i_1, 1}, \dots, x_{i_1, \mu}) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\mu$ for each $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$. Then, $\mathcal{B}$ responds as follows.

- If $\ell \leq d^*$, let $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ be the smallest index such that $\vec{X}_i \cdot \vec{Y}_i^\beta \neq 0$ (by hypothesis, this index must exist). By choosing $r_w \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p$ and $r_i \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p$, $\mathcal{B}$ implicitly defines the exponent

$$\tilde{r}_i = r_i + \frac{a \cdot r_w \cdot x}{\gamma_{i, 0} \cdot \vec{X}_i \cdot \vec{Y}_i^\beta}$$

and can compute

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\prod_{i_2=1}^{\mu} \hat{h}_{i, i_2}^{x_{i, i_2}} \right)^{\tilde{r}_i} \cdot \hat{w}^{r_w} &= \left(\prod_{i_2=1}^{\mu} \hat{h}_{i, i_2}^{x_{i, i_2}} \right)^{r_i} \cdot \left((\hat{g}^b)^{-\gamma_{i, 0} \cdot \vec{X}_i \cdot \vec{Y}_i^\beta} \cdot \hat{g}^{\vec{\gamma}_i \cdot \vec{Y}_i^\beta} \right)^{a \cdot \frac{r_w \cdot x}{\gamma_{i, 0} \cdot \vec{X}_i \cdot \vec{Y}_i^\beta}} \\ &\quad \cdot (\hat{g}^{ab})^{r_w \cdot x} \cdot \hat{g}^{r_w \cdot y} \\ &= \left(\prod_{i_2=1}^{\mu} \hat{h}_{i, i_2}^{x_{i, i_2}} \right)^{r_i} \cdot (\hat{g}^a)^{\vec{\gamma}_i \cdot \vec{Y}_i^\beta \cdot \frac{r_w \cdot x}{\gamma_{i, 0} \cdot \vec{X}_i \cdot \vec{Y}_i^\beta}} \cdot \hat{g}^{r_w \cdot y} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

without knowing $\hat{g}^{ab}$. Similarly, it can compute

$$D_i = \hat{v}^{\tilde{r}_i} = \hat{g}^{\gamma_v \cdot r_i} \cdot (\hat{g}^a)^{\gamma_v \cdot r_w \cdot x / (\gamma_{i, 0} \cdot \vec{X}_i \cdot \vec{Y}_i^\beta)}$$

as well as $D_w = \hat{v}^{r_w}$.

We now turn to indices $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\} \setminus \{i\}$, for which $\mathcal{B}$ can trivially compute $(\prod_{i_2=1}^{\mu} \hat{h}_{i_1, i_2}^{x_{i_1, i_2}})^{r_{i_1}}$ and $D_{i_1} = \hat{v}^{r_{i_1}} \cdot S_{v, i_1}$ since it knows $\{\hat{h}_{i_1, i_2}\}_{i_2=0}^{\mu}$ and v . This suffices for computing the whole decryption component SK_D of the private key.

As for the delegation component SK_{DL} , $\mathcal{B}$ can compute $\{K_{j, k}\}_{j \in \{\ell+1, \dots, d\}, k \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}}$, $\{L_j\}_{j=\ell+1}^d$ and $\{L_{w, j, k}\}_{j, k}$ by applying exactly the same procedure as for D , D_i and D_w (and taking advantage of the fact that $\vec{X}_i \cdot \vec{Y}_i^\beta \neq 0$ for at least one $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$). Remaining pieces of SK_{DL} are then trivially computable since $\mathcal{B}$ has $\{\hat{h}_{i_1, i_2}\}_{i_2=0}^{\mu}$ and $\hat{v}$ at disposal.

- If $\ell > d^*$, it can be the case that $\vec{X}_i \cdot \vec{Y}_i^\beta = 0$ for $i = 1$ to ℓ . However, with overwhelming probability, there must exist $i \in \{d^* + 1, \dots, \ell\}$ such that $\vec{X}_i \cdot \vec{Y}_i^\beta \neq 0$ since the vectors $\vec{Y}_{d^*+1}, \dots, \vec{Y}_d$ have been chosen at random and, due to the generation of the public key as per (2), they are completely independent of $\mathcal{A}$'s view. It comes that $\mathcal{B}$ can generate a private key in the same way as in the case $\ell < d^*$ (see equation (3)).

When $\mathcal{B}$ has to construct the challenge ciphertext, $\mathcal{B}$ sets $C_0 = M \cdot e(g^c, \hat{g}^{\gamma_v})^\alpha$, where $M \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{G}_T$, and

$$C_v = (g^c)^{\gamma_v}, \quad C_w = (g^c)^y \cdot (g^z)^x,$$

$$C_{i_1, i_2} = (g^c)^{\gamma_{i_1, i_2}} \quad i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d^*\}, \quad i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$$

We observe that, if $z = abc$, $(C_0, C_v, C_w, \{C_{i_1, i_2}\}_{i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d^*\}, i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}})$ corresponds to a valid ciphertext with the encryption exponent $s = c$. In this situation, $\mathcal{B}$ is playing Game₂ with $\mathcal{A}$.

In contrast, if $z \in_R \mathbb{Z}_p$, we have $z \neq c$ with overwhelming probability. In this case, we have $g^z = g^{abc+\theta}$, for some $\theta \neq 0$, and we can thus write $C_w = w^c \cdot g^{\theta \cdot x}$. This means that C_w looks uniformly random and independent from $\mathcal{A}$'s view. Indeed, until the challenge phase, $\mathcal{A}$ has no information about $\theta \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ (recall that public parameters do not depend on c) and the value $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{p_1}$ is also independent of $\mathcal{A}$'s view. We conclude that, if g^z is such that $z \in_R \mathbb{Z}_p$, we are in Game₃. $\square$

Lemma 5. *For each $\delta_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and each $\delta_2 \in \{2, \dots, \mu\}$, $\text{Game}_{4,\delta_1,\delta_2-1}$ and $\text{Game}_{4,\delta_1,\delta_2}$ are computationally indistinguishable if the $\mathcal{P}$ -BDH₁ assumption holds in $(\mathbb{G}, \hat{\mathbb{G}})$.*

Proof. Towards a contradiction, we assume there exists δ_1, δ_2 such that the adversary $\mathcal{A}$ outputs $\beta' = \beta$ with significantly different probabilities in $\text{Game}_{4,\delta_1,\delta_2-1}$ and $\text{Game}_{4,\delta_1,\delta_2}$. We show that $\mathcal{A}$ implies a distinguisher $\mathcal{B}$ against $\mathcal{P}$ -BDH₁.

Our distinguisher $\mathcal{B}$ receives as input $(g, g^b, g^{ab}, g^c, \hat{g}, \hat{g}^a, \hat{g}^b, g^z)$, with $a, b, c \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p$. It aims to decide if $z = abc$ or $z \in_R \mathbb{Z}_p$.

To do this, $\mathcal{B}$ runs the adversary $\mathcal{A}$ as follows. It first receives the challenge vectors $(\vec{Y}_0^0, \dots, \vec{Y}_{d^*}^0)$, $(\vec{Y}_0^1, \dots, \vec{Y}_{d^*}^1)$, at some depth $d^* \leq d$, that are chosen by $\mathcal{A}$. We assume that $\mathcal{B}$ chooses its challenge bit $\beta \xleftarrow{R} \{0, 1\}$ at the outset of the game. Also, if $d^* < d$, for each $i \in \{d^* + 1, \dots, d\}$, $\mathcal{B}$ defines the vector $\vec{Y}_i^\beta$ as a random vector of $\mathbb{Z}_p^\mu$.

It defines the master public key by setting $e(g, \hat{v})^\alpha = e(g, \hat{g})^{\alpha \cdot \gamma_v}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} v &= g^{\gamma_v}, \\ h_{i_1,0} &= g_{p_1}^{\gamma_{i_1,0}} && \text{for } i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\} \\ h_{i_1,i_2} &= g^{-\gamma_{i_1,0} \cdot y_{i_1,i_2}^\beta} \cdot g^{\gamma_{i_1,i_2}} && \text{if } i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\} \setminus \{\delta_1\} \text{ or } i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \mu\} \setminus \{\delta_2\} \\ h_{\delta_1,\delta_2} &= g^{-\gamma_{\delta_1,0} \cdot y_{\delta_1,\delta_2}^\beta} \cdot (g^{ab})^{\gamma_{\delta_1,\delta_2}} \\ w &= g^y \cdot (g^b)^x, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $\alpha, \gamma_v, y \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p$, $x \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$ and $\gamma_{i_1,i_2} \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p$, for each $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, $i_2 \in \{0, \dots, \mu\}$. For each i_1 , we also define the vector $\vec{\gamma}_{i_1} = (\gamma_{i_1,1}, \dots, \gamma_{i_1,\mu}) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\mu$. Note that, in the implicitly defined master secret key msk , the distinguisher $\mathcal{B}$ knows all the components but $\hat{h}_{\delta_1,\delta_2}$, which depends on the unknown term $\hat{g}^{ab}$.

When the adversary $\mathcal{A}$ requests a key for a hierarchical vector $\mathbf{X} = (\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)$, $\mathcal{B}$ parses $\vec{X}_{i_1}$ as $(x_{i_1,1}, \dots, x_{i_1,\mu}) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\mu$ for each $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$. Then, $\mathcal{B}$ responds as follows.

- If $\ell \geq \delta_1$, $\mathcal{B}$ chooses $r'_w \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p$ and $r_{\delta_1} \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p$, $\mathcal{B}$ implicitly defines the exponent

$$r_w = r'_w - \frac{a \cdot r_{\delta_1} \cdot \gamma_{\delta_1,\delta_2}}{x} \tag{5}$$

and can compute the product

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\hat{h}_{\delta_1,0}^{y_{\delta_1,\delta_2}^\beta} \cdot \hat{h}_{\delta_1,\delta_2} \right)^{r_{\delta_1}} \cdot \hat{w}^{r_w} &= (\hat{g}^{ab})^{\gamma_{\delta_1,\delta_2} \cdot r_{\delta_1}} \cdot \hat{w}^{r'_w} \cdot (\hat{g}^y (\hat{g}^b)^x)^{-a \cdot r_{\delta_1} \cdot \gamma_{\delta_1,\delta_2}/x} \\ &= \hat{w}^{r'_w} \cdot (\hat{g}^a)^{-y \cdot r_{\delta_1} \cdot \gamma_{\delta_1,\delta_2}/x}, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

which is the only factor of D that it cannot trivially compute without knowing $\hat{g}^{ab}$. Similarly, it can compute $D_w = v^{r_w} = \hat{g}^{\gamma_v \cdot r'_w} \cdot (\hat{g}^a)^{-\gamma_v \cdot r_{\delta_1} \cdot \gamma_{\delta_1,\delta_2}/x}$.

To generate the delegation component SK_{DL} of the key, the reduction $\mathcal{B}$ is able to compute

$\{K_{j,k}, L_{w,j,k}\}_{j \in \{\ell+1, \dots, d\}, k \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}}$ by repeating $(d - \ell) \cdot \mu$ times the same procedure as for computing D and D_w .

• If $\ell < \delta_1$, $\mathcal{B}$ can directly compute $(D, D_w, \{D_{i_1}\}_{i_1=1}^\ell)$ since it knows $\{\hat{h}_{i_1, i_2}\}_{i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}, i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}}$, $\hat{v}$ and $\hat{w}$. The difficulty is to compute the delegation components $\{K_{\delta_1, k}\}_{k=1}^\mu$ without knowing $\hat{g}^{ab}$. In fact, among these components, the only factor of K_{δ_1, δ_2} that $\mathcal{B}$ cannot trivially compute is $\hat{h}_{\delta_1, \delta_2}^{s_{\delta_1}}$. However, similarly to (5)-(6), it can choose $s_{\delta_1}, s'_{w, \delta_1, \delta_2} \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p$, define $s_{w, \delta_1, \delta_2} = s'_{w, \delta_1, \delta_2} - \frac{a \cdot s_{\delta_1} \cdot \gamma_{\delta_1, \delta_2}}{x}$ and compute the product

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\delta_1, \delta_2}^{s_{\delta_1}} \cdot \hat{w}^{s_{w, \delta_1, \delta_2}} &= (\hat{g}^{-\gamma_{\delta_1, 0} \cdot y_{\delta_1, \delta_2}^\beta \cdot s_{\delta_1}}) \cdot (\hat{g}^{ab})^{\gamma_{\delta_1, \delta_2} \cdot s_{\delta_1}} \cdot (\hat{g}^y (\hat{g}^b)^x)^{-a \cdot s_{\delta_1} \cdot \gamma_{\delta_1, \delta_2} / x} \cdot \hat{w}^{s'_{w, \delta_1, \delta_2}} \\ &= (\hat{g}^{-\gamma_{\delta_1, 0} \cdot y_{\delta_1, \delta_2}^\beta \cdot s_{\delta_1}}) \cdot \hat{w}^{s'_{w, \delta_1, \delta_2}} \cdot (\hat{g}^a)^{-y \cdot s_{\delta_1} \cdot \gamma_{\delta_1, \delta_2} / x} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

In the same way, $\mathcal{B}$ computes

$$L_{w, \delta_1, \delta_2} = \hat{v}^{s_{w, \delta_1, \delta_2}} = \hat{g}^{\gamma_v \cdot s'_{w, \delta_1, \delta_2}} \cdot (\hat{g}^a)^{-\gamma_v \cdot s_{\delta_1} \cdot \gamma_{\delta_1, \delta_2} / x}.$$

Note that, for each $k \in \{1, \dots, \mu\} \setminus \{\delta_2\}$, $\mathcal{B}$ has to generate $K_{\delta_1, k}$ by computing $\hat{h}_{\delta_1, k}^{s_{\delta_1}}$ using the same random exponent s_{δ_1} as in (7). This is always possible since $\mathcal{B}$ knows that exponent.

When it comes to construct the challenge ciphertext, algorithm $\mathcal{B}$ first sets $C_0 = M \cdot e(g^c, \hat{g}^{\gamma_v})^\alpha$, where $M \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{G}_T$. It also chooses $\Gamma_w \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{G}$ and computes

$$C_v = (g^c)^{\gamma_v}, \quad C_w = \Gamma_w,$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned} C_{i_1, i_2} &= (g^c)^{\gamma_{i_1, i_2}} & \text{if } (i_1 > \delta_1) \vee ((i_1 = \delta_1) \wedge (i_2 > \delta_2)) \\ C_{\delta_1, \delta_2} &= (g^z)^{\gamma_{\delta_1, \delta_2}} \end{aligned}$$

If $i_1 < \delta_1$ or $i_1 = \delta_1$ and $i_2 < \delta_2$, then C_{i_1, i_2} is chosen uniformly in $\mathbb{G}$.

We observe that, in the situation where $z = abc$, $(C_0, C_v, C_w, \{C_{i_1, i_2}\}_{i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d^*\}, i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}})$ is distributed in the same way as in $\text{Game}_{4, \delta_1, \delta_2-1}$.

In contrast, if $z \in_R \mathbb{Z}_p$, we have $z \neq c$ with overwhelming probability. In this case, C_{δ_1, δ_2} looks random to the adversary and $\mathcal{B}$ is thus playing $\text{Game}_{4, \delta_1, \delta_2}$. $\square$

4 A Hierarchical Identity-Based Lossy Trapdoor Function

4.1 Intuition

From the HPE scheme of Section 3, our hierarchical lossy function is obtained by including a $n \times n$ matrix of HPE ciphertexts in the master public parameters. As in the DDH-based lossy function of Peikert and Waters [25], each row of the matrix is associated with an encryption exponent, which is re-used throughout the entire row. Each column corresponds to a different set of public parameters in the HPE system.

Depending on whether the public parameters of the HIB-LTDF are prepared for the injective mode or the partially lossy mode, all HPE ciphertexts in the matrix correspond to different hierarchical vectors $(\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_d) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^{d \cdot \mu}$. The selective weak attribute-hiding property of the HPE scheme

guarantees that the two setups are computationally indistinguishable.

In order to evaluate a function for some hierarchical identity $\text{id} = (\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_\ell)$, the evaluation algorithm first computes a transformation on HPE ciphertexts. During this transformation, inner products of the form $\langle \mathbf{y}_{i_1}, \text{id}_{i_1} \rangle$ are calculated in the exponent for $i_1 = 1$ to ℓ . The transformation gives a $n \times n$ matrix (10) of anonymous HIBE ciphertexts that are always well-formed in non-diagonal entries. As for diagonal entries, they contain “perturbed” HIBE ciphertexts: at each level, one ciphertext component contains a perturbation factor of the form $\langle \mathbf{y}_{i_1}, \text{id}_{i_1} \rangle$. In this matrix of HIBE ciphertexts, random encryption exponents are again re-used in all positions at each row.

The function evaluation is then carried out as in [25], by computing a matrix-vector product in the exponent and taking advantage of homomorphic properties of the HIBE scheme over the randomness space. The function output can be seen as a set of n anonymous HIBE ciphertexts – one for each input bit – which are well-formed ciphertexts if and only if the corresponding input bit is 0 (*i.e.*, if and only if the perturbation factors $\{\langle \mathbf{y}_{i_1}, \text{id}_{i_1} \rangle\}_{i_1=1}^\ell$ are left out when computing the matrix-vector product in the exponent). The function is thus inverted by testing the well-formedness of each HIBE ciphertext using the private key.

In the injective mode, the public parameters are generated in such a way that, for all identities $\text{id} = (\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_\ell)$, we have $\langle \mathbf{y}_{i_1}, \text{id}_{i_1} \rangle \neq 0$ for each $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$. In the partially lossy mode, we have $\langle \mathbf{y}_{i_1}, \text{id}_{i_1} \rangle = 0$ for each $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ with non-negligible probability. In this case, the inversion algorithm always outputs 0^n , regardless of the input.

4.2 Description

HF.Setup(λ, d, n, μ): given a security parameter $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$, the (constant) desired number of levels in the hierarchy $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and integers $\mu, n \in \text{poly}(\lambda)$ specifying the length of identities and that of function inputs, respectively, choose asymmetric bilinear groups $(\mathbb{G}, \hat{\mathbb{G}}, \mathbb{G}_T)$ of prime order $p > 2^\lambda$. Define $\text{InpSp} = \{0, 1\}^n$, $\Sigma_{\text{ID}} = \{(1, \mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^{\mu-1}\}$ and $\text{IdSp} = \Sigma_{\text{ID}}^{(\leq d)}$. The public parameters are $\text{pms} = (p, (\mathbb{G}, \hat{\mathbb{G}}, \mathbb{G}_T), d, n, \mu, \text{InpSp}, \text{IdSp})$.

As in [7], the master key generation algorithm of our HIB-TDF receives an auxiliary input $\mathbf{y}$. Here, it is a concatenation of row vectors $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_d \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\mu$.

HF.MKg($\text{pms}, \mathbf{y}$): parse the auxiliary input as $\mathbf{y} = [\mathbf{y}_1 | \dots | \mathbf{y}_d] \in \mathbb{Z}_p^{d \cdot \mu}$, and proceed as follows.

1. Choose $\alpha_v \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$, $\alpha_w \xleftarrow{R} (\mathbb{Z}_p^*)^n$, and $\alpha_h \xleftarrow{R} (\mathbb{Z}_p^*)^{d \times (\mu+1) \times n}$. Define $v = g^{\alpha_v}$, $\hat{v} = \hat{g}^{\alpha_v}$, $\mathbf{w} = g^{\alpha_w} \in \mathbb{G}^n$ and $\hat{\mathbf{w}} = \hat{g}^{\alpha_w} \in \hat{\mathbb{G}}^n$. Likewise, set $\mathbf{h} = g^{\alpha_h} \in \mathbb{G}^{d \times (\mu+1) \times n}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{h}} = \hat{g}^{\alpha_h} \in \hat{\mathbb{G}}^{d \times (\mu+1) \times n}$. Define

$$\text{PP}_{\text{core}} := \left(v, \{\mathbf{w}[l_1]\}_{l_1=1}^n, \{\mathbf{h}[i_1, i_2, l_1]\}_{i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}, i_2 \in \{0, \dots, \mu\}, l_1 \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \right)$$

2. For $i_1 = 1$ to d , parse $\mathbf{y}_{i_1}$ as $(\mathbf{y}_{i_1}[1], \dots, \mathbf{y}_{i_1}[\mu]) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\mu$. For $l_2 = 1$ to n , conduct the following steps.

- a. Choose $\mathbf{s}[l_2] \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$ and compute $\mathbf{J}[l_2] = v^{\mathbf{s}[l_2]}$ as well as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C}_w[l_2, l_1] &= \mathbf{w}[l_1]^{\mathbf{s}[l_2]} \\ \mathbf{C}[i_1, i_2, l_2, l_1] &= (\mathbf{h}[i_1, 0, l_1]^{\mathbf{y}_{i_1}[i_2] \cdot \Delta(l_2, l_1)} \cdot \mathbf{h}[i_1, i_2, l_1])^{\mathbf{s}[l_2]} \end{aligned}$$

for each $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, $i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$, $l_1 \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

b. Define a $n \times n$ matrix $\{\mathbf{CT}[l_2, l_1]\}_{l_2, l_1 \in \{1, \dots, n\}}$ of HPE ciphertexts

$$\mathbf{CT}[l_2, l_1] = (\mathbf{J}[l_2], \mathbf{C}_w[l_2, l_1], \{\mathbf{C}[i_1, i_2, l_2, l_1]\}_{i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}, i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}}). \quad (8)$$

The master public key consists of $\text{mpk} := (\text{PP}_{\text{core}}, \{\mathbf{CT}[l_2, l_1]\}_{l_2, l_1 \in \{1, \dots, n\}})$ while the master secret key consists of $\text{msk} := (\hat{v}, \hat{\mathbf{w}}, \hat{\mathbf{h}})$.

HF.Kg(pms, msk, $(\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_\ell)$): to generate a key for an identity $(\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_\ell) \in \text{IdSp}$, parse msk as $(\hat{v}, \hat{\mathbf{w}}, \hat{\mathbf{h}})$ and id_{i_1} as $\text{id}_{i_1}[1] \dots \text{id}_{i_1}[\mu]$ for $i_1 = 1$ to ℓ . Choose $\mathbf{r}_w, \mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_\ell \xleftarrow{R} (\mathbb{Z}_p^*)^n$. For each $l_1 \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, compute the decryption component $\mathbf{SK}_D = (\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{D}_w, \{\mathbf{D}_{i_1}\}_{i_1=1}^\ell)$ of the key as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{D}[l_1] &= \prod_{i_1=1}^\ell \left(\prod_{i_2=1}^\mu \hat{\mathbf{h}}[i_1, i_2, l_1]^{\text{id}_{i_1}[i_2]} \right)^{\mathbf{r}_{i_1}[l_1]} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{w}}[l_1]^{\mathbf{r}_w[l_1]}, \\ \mathbf{D}_w[l_1] &= \hat{v}^{\mathbf{r}_w[l_1]}, \quad \mathbf{D}_{i_1}[l_1] = \hat{v}^{\mathbf{r}_{i_1}[l_1]} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

and the delegation component

$$\mathbf{SK}_{DL} = (\{\mathbf{K}[j, k, l_1]\}_{j, k, l_1}, \{\mathbf{L}[j, l_1]\}_{j, l_1}, \{\mathbf{L}[j, k, i_1, l_1]\}_{j, k, i_1, l_1}, \{\mathbf{L}_w[j, k, l_1]\}_{j, k, l_1}),$$

with $j \in \{\ell + 1, \dots, d\}$, $k \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$ and $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ as

$$\mathbf{K}[j, k, l_1] = \prod_{i_1=1}^\ell \left(\prod_{i_2=1}^\mu \hat{\mathbf{h}}[i_1, i_2, l_1]^{\text{id}_{i_1}[i_2]} \right)^{\mathbf{s}[j, k, i_1, l_1]} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{h}}[j, k, l_1]^{\mathbf{s}'[j, l_1]} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{w}}[l_1]^{\mathbf{s}_w[j, k, l_1]},$$

$$\mathbf{L}[j, l_1] = \hat{v}^{\mathbf{s}'[j, l_1]}, \quad \mathbf{L}[j, k, i_1, l_1] = \hat{v}^{\mathbf{s}[j, k, i_1, l_1]} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{L}_w[j, k, l_1] = \hat{v}^{\mathbf{s}_w[j, k, l_1]}.$$

Output $\mathbf{SK}_{(\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_\ell)} = (\mathbf{SK}_D, \mathbf{SK}_{DL})$.

HF.Del(pms, mpk, $(\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_\ell)$, $\mathbf{SK}_{(\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_\ell)}$, $\text{id}_{\ell+1}$): parse $\mathbf{SK}_{(\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_\ell)}$ as a HF private key of the form $(\mathbf{SK}_D, \mathbf{SK}_{DL})$, and $\text{id}_{\ell+1}$ as a string $\text{id}_{\ell+1}[1] \dots \text{id}_{\ell+1}[\mu] \in \Sigma_{\text{ID}}$.

1. For $l_1 = 1$ to n , define auxiliary master key pairs $(\text{msk}[l_1], \text{mpk}[l_1])$ as

$$\text{mpk}[l_1] = (v, \mathbf{w}[l_1], \{\mathbf{h}[i_1, i_2, l_1]\}_{i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}, i_2 \in \{0, \dots, \mu\}}).$$

Define ℓ -th level HPE keys $\mathbf{SK}_{(\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_\ell)}[l_1] = (\mathbf{SK}_D[l_1], \mathbf{SK}_{DL}[l_1])$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{SK}_D[l_1] &= (\mathbf{D}[l_1], \mathbf{D}_w[l_1], \{\mathbf{D}_{i_1}[l_1]\}_{i_1=1}^\ell) \\ \mathbf{SK}_{DL}[l_1] &= (\{\mathbf{K}[j, k, l_1]\}_{j, k}, \{\mathbf{L}[j, l_1]\}_j, \{\mathbf{L}[j, k, i_1, l_1]\}_{j, k, i_1}, \{\mathbf{L}_w[j, k, l_1]\}_{j, k}). \end{aligned}$$

2. For $l_1 = 1$ to n , run **Delegate**($\text{mpk}[l_1], (\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_\ell), \mathbf{SK}_{(\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_\ell)}[l_1], \text{id}_{\ell+1}$) (as specified in Section 3) to get $\mathbf{SK}_{(\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_\ell, \text{id}_{\ell+1})}[l_1] = (\mathbf{SK}'_D[l_1], \mathbf{SK}'_{DL}[l_1])$.

Finally return $\{\mathbf{SK}_{(\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_\ell, \text{id}_{\ell+1})}[l_1]\}_{l_1=1}^n$.

HF.Eval(pms, mpk, $(\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_\ell)$, X): Given a n -bit input $X = x_1 \dots x_n \in \{0, 1\}^n$, for $i_1 = 1$ to ℓ , parse id_{i_1} as $\text{id}_{i_1}[1] \dots \text{id}_{i_1}[\mu]$. For $l_1 = 1$ to n , do the following.

1. For each $l_2 \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, compute modified HPE ciphertexts by defining

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C}_{\text{id}}[i_1, l_2, l_1] &= \prod_{i_2=1}^{\mu} \mathbf{C}[i_1, i_2, l_2, l_1]^{\text{id}_{i_1}[i_2]} \\ &= \left(\mathbf{h}[i_1, 0, l_1]^{\langle \mathbf{y}_{i_1}, \text{id}_{i_1} \rangle \cdot \Delta(l_2, l_1)} \cdot \prod_{i_2=1}^{\mu} \mathbf{h}[i_1, i_2, l_1]^{\text{id}_{i_1}[i_2]} \right)^{\mathbf{s}[l_2]} \end{aligned}$$

for each $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$, $l_1, l_2 \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. The modified ciphertexts are

$$\mathbf{CT}_{\text{id}}[l_2, l_1] = (\mathbf{J}[l_2], \{\mathbf{CT}_{\text{id}}[i_1, l_2, l_1]\}_{i_1=1}^{\ell}) \in \mathbb{G}^{\ell+1}. \quad (10)$$

The resulting $\{\mathbf{CT}_{\text{id}}[l_2, l_1]\}_{l_2, l_1 \in \{1, \dots, n\}}$ thus form a $n \times n$ matrix of anonymous HIBE ciphertexts for the identity $\text{id} = (\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_{\ell})$.

2. Compute $C_{\text{id}, v} = \prod_{l_2=1}^n \mathbf{J}[l_2]^{x_{l_2}} = v^{\langle \mathbf{s}, X \rangle}$ as well as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{CT}_{\text{id}, w}[l_1] &= \prod_{l_2=1}^n \mathbf{C}_w[l_2, l_1]^{x_{l_2}} = \mathbf{w}[l_1]^{\langle \mathbf{s}, X \rangle}, \\ \mathbf{CT}_{\text{id}}[i_1, l_1] &= \prod_{l_2=1}^n \mathbf{C}_{\text{id}}[i_1, l_2, l_1]^{x_{l_2}} \\ &= \mathbf{h}[i_1, 0, l_1]^{\mathbf{s}[l_1] \cdot x_{l_1} \cdot \langle \mathbf{y}_{i_1}, \text{id}_{i_1} \rangle} \cdot \left(\prod_{i_2=1}^{\mu} \mathbf{h}[i_1, i_2, l_1]^{\text{id}_{i_1}[i_2]} \right)^{\langle \mathbf{s}, X \rangle} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Then return the output

$$C = (C_{\text{id}, v}, \{\mathbf{CT}_{\text{id}, w}[l_1]\}_{l_1=1}^n, \{\mathbf{CT}_{\text{id}}[i_1, l_1]\}_{i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}, l_1 \in \{1, \dots, n\}}) \in \mathbb{G}^{n+1+n \times \ell}. \quad (12)$$

HF.Inv(pms, mpk, $(\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_{\ell})$, $\mathbf{SK}_{(\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_{\ell})}$, C): parse the decryption component $\mathbf{SK}_D$ of the private key as a tuple of the form $(\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{D}_w, \mathbf{D}_{\bar{w}}, \{\mathbf{D}_{i_1}\}_{i_1=1}^{\ell})$ and the output C as per (12). Then, for $l_1 = 1$ to n , set $x_{l_1} = 0$ if

$$e(C_{\text{id}, v}, \mathbf{D}[l_1]) \cdot e(\mathbf{CT}_{\text{id}, w}[l_1], \mathbf{D}_w[l_1])^{-1} \cdot \prod_{i_1=1}^{\ell} e(\mathbf{CT}_{\text{id}}[i_1, l_1], \mathbf{D}_{i_1}[l_1])^{-1} = 1_{\mathbb{G}_T}. \quad (13)$$

Otherwise, set $x_{l_1} = 1$. Eventually, return $X = x_1 \dots x_n \in \{0, 1\}^n$.

From (11), we notice that, with overwhelming probability, if there exists some $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ such that $\langle \mathbf{y}_{i_1}, \text{id}_{i_1} \rangle \neq 0$, relation (13) is satisfied if and only if $x_{l_1} = 0$. Indeed, in this case, the output (12) is distributed as a vector of n Boneh-Boyen HIBE ciphertexts (in their anonymous variant considered in [15]). These ciphertexts correspond to the same encryption exponent $\langle \mathbf{s}, X \rangle$ and are generated under n distinct master public keys sharing the same component $v \in \mathbb{G}$.

When the function is implemented in injective mode, the auxiliary input consists of a vector $\mathbf{y}^{(0)} = [(1, 0, \dots, 0) | \dots | (1, 0, \dots, 0)] \in \mathbb{Z}_p^{d \cdot \mu}$. Since $\text{id}_{i_1}[1] = 1$ for each i_1 , this guarantees injectivity since $\langle \mathbf{y}_{i_1}^{(0)}, \text{id}_{i_1} \rangle \neq 0$ for each i_1 .

4.3 Security Analysis

We prove that the HIB-LTDF in the previous section satisfies the required security property (Definition 2), both against selective and adaptive adversaries.

To analyze the security of the scheme, in both the adaptive and the selective cases, we define two experiments, RL_0 and RL_n . In both of them, HF.Setup is run and the public parameters are given to the adversary. Algorithm HF.MKg is run with auxiliary input $\mathbf{y}^{(0)} = [(1, 0, \dots, 0) \mid \dots \mid (1, 0, \dots, 0)]$ in RL_0 , and with auxiliary input $\mathbf{y}^{(1)} = [\mathbf{y}_1^{(1)} \mid \dots \mid \mathbf{y}_d^{(1)}]$ in the experiment RL_n , where $\mathbf{y}^{(1)}$ is produced by an auxiliary input generator $\text{Aux}(\text{id})$ taking as input a special hierarchical identity $\text{id} = (\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_\ell)$. The master public key mpk is given to the adversary. The adversary can request secret keys for identities id , as in definition 2, which will be answered using HF.Kg and HF.Del and will be added to IS , which is initialized to $IS = \{\emptyset\}$. Also, the adversary will output a hierarchical identity id^* , as in definition 2. Finally, the adversary will output a guess d' . Both in RL_0 and RL_n , the experiment will halt and output 0 if a) for any $\text{id} = (\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_\ell) \in IS$ we have that $\langle y_{i_1}^{(1)}, \vec{\text{id}}_{i_1} \rangle = 0$ for each $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ or b) if $\langle y_{i_1}^{(1)}, \vec{\text{id}}_{i_1}^* \rangle \neq 0$ for some $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell^*\}$. If the experiment has not aborted, it will output the bit d' .

In both the selective and the adaptive cases, security will be a result of the following lemma, that we prove in a different section.

Lemma 6. *Under the $\mathcal{P}\text{-BDH}_1$ and DDH_2 assumptions, the experiments RL_0 and RL_n return 1 with nearly identical probabilities. Namely, there exist PPT algorithms $\mathcal{B}_1$ and $\mathcal{B}_2$ such that*

$$|\Pr[RL_0 \Rightarrow 1] - \Pr[RL_n \Rightarrow 1]| \leq n \cdot ((d \cdot \mu + 1) \cdot \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathcal{P}\text{-BDH}_1}(\mathcal{B}_1) + q \cdot \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathcal{P}\text{-DDH}_2}(\mathcal{B}_2)),$$

where q is the number of “Reveal-key” queries made by the adversary $\mathcal{A}$.

Proof of Lemma 6

We consider a sequence of $n + 1$ hybrid experiments $RL_0, \dots, RL_n$. For each $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, RL_k is defined to be an experiment where public parameters are generated as follows. First, the simulator $\mathcal{B}$ chooses $v \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{G}$, $\mathbf{w} \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{G}^n$, $\hat{\mathbf{w}} \xleftarrow{R} \hat{\mathbb{G}}^n$, $\mathbf{h} \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{G}^{d \times (\mu+1) \times n}$, $\hat{\mathbf{h}} \xleftarrow{R} \hat{\mathbb{G}}^{d \times (\mu+1) \times n}$ and computes PP_{core} in the same way as in the real scheme.

In the second step of the setup procedure, the simulator $\mathcal{B}$ chooses a vector $\mathbf{s} \xleftarrow{R} (\mathbb{Z}_p^*)^n$. For $l_1, l_2 \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, it first computes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{J}[l_2] &= v^{\mathbf{s}[l_2]}, \\ \mathbf{C}_w[l_2, l_1] &= \mathbf{w}[l_1]^{\mathbf{s}[l_2]}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for each pair (l_1, l_2) such that $l_1 \neq l_2$, $\mathcal{B}$ sets

$$\mathbf{C}[i_1, i_2, l_2, l_1] = \mathbf{h}[i_1, i_2, l_1]^{\mathbf{s}[l_2]}.$$

Finally, for each $l \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and $i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$, $\mathcal{B}$ defines

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C}[i_1, i_2, l, l] &= \left(\mathbf{h}[i_1, 0, l]^{\mathbf{y}_{i_1}^{(0)}}[i_2] \cdot \mathbf{h}[i_1, i_2, l] \right)^{\mathbf{s}[l]} & \text{if } l \leq k, \\ \mathbf{C}[i_1, i_2, l, l] &= \left(\mathbf{h}[i_1, 0, l]^{\mathbf{y}_{i_1}^{(1)}}[i_2] \cdot \mathbf{h}[i_1, i_2, l] \right)^{\mathbf{s}[l]} & \text{if } l > k. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 7 demonstrates that, for each $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, experiment RL_k is computationally indistinguishable from experiment RL_{k-1} .

If we assume that the statement of Lemma 6 is false, there must exist $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that the adversary can distinguish RL_k from RL_{k-1} and we obtain a contradiction. $\square$

Lemma 7. *If the HPE scheme described in Section 3 is selectively weakly attribute-hiding, then Game RL_k is indistinguishable from Game RL_{k-1} for each $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Namely, for each k , there exist algorithms $\mathcal{B}_1$ and $\mathcal{B}_2$ such that*

$$|\Pr[RL_k \Rightarrow 1] - \Pr[RL_{k-1} \Rightarrow 1]| \leq (d \cdot \mu + 1) \cdot \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathcal{P}\text{-BDH}_1}(\mathcal{B}_1) + q \cdot \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathcal{P}\text{-BDH}_2}(\mathcal{B}_2),$$

where q is the number of “Reveal-key” queries made by $\mathcal{A}$.

Proof. For the sake of contradiction, let us assume that there exist two auxiliary hierarchical vector $\mathbf{y}^{(0)} = [\mathbf{y}_1^{(0)} | \dots | \mathbf{y}_d^{(0)}]$, $\mathbf{y}^{(1)} = [\mathbf{y}_1^{(1)} | \dots | \mathbf{y}_d^{(1)}]$ and an index $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that the adversary $\mathcal{A}$ has noticeably different behaviors in experiments RL_k and RL_{k-1} . Using $\mathcal{A}$, we construct a selective weakly attribute-hiding adversary $\mathcal{B}$ against the HPE scheme described in Section 3 (in its predicate-only variant).

Our adversary $\mathcal{B}$ first declares $\mathbf{y}^{(0)}, \mathbf{y}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^{d \cdot \mu}$ as the vectors that it wishes to be challenged upon. Then, the HPE challenger provides $\mathcal{B}$ with public parameters

$$\mathbf{mpk}_{\text{HPE}} = \left(v, w, \{h_{i_1, i_2}\}_{i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}, i_2 \in \{0, \dots, \mu\}} \right).$$

Then, $\mathcal{B}$ chooses a vector $\boldsymbol{\zeta} \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^n$ and a matrix $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^{d \times (\mu+1) \times n}$, which it uses to compute

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{w}[l_1] &= v^{\boldsymbol{\zeta}[l_1]} & \text{for } l_1 \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{k\} \\ \mathbf{h}[i_1, i_2, l_1] &= v^{\boldsymbol{\gamma}[i_1, i_2, l_1]} & \text{for } i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}, i_2 \in \{0, \dots, \mu\}, l_1 \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{k\}. \end{aligned}$$

It also sets $\mathbf{w}[k] = w$ as well as

$$\mathbf{h}[i_1, i_2, k] = h_{i_1, i_2} \quad \text{for } i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}, i_2 \in \{0, \dots, \mu\}.$$

Then, $\mathcal{B}$ defines core public parameters

$$\mathbf{PP}_{\text{core}} = \left(v, \{\mathbf{w}[l_1], \{\mathbf{h}[i_1, i_2, l_1]\}_{i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}, i_2 \in \{0, \dots, \mu\}, l_1 \in \{1, \dots, n\}}\} \right),$$

that correspond to the master secret key $\mathbf{msk} = (\hat{v}, \hat{\mathbf{w}}, \hat{\mathbf{h}})$, which is not completely known to $\mathcal{B}$ (specifically, $\hat{v}$, $\hat{\mathbf{w}}[k]$ and $\hat{\mathbf{h}}[., ., k]$ are not available). Then, $\mathcal{B}$ notifies its HPE challenger that it wishes to directly enter the challenge phase without making any pre-challenge query. The challenger replies with the challenge ciphertext

$$C^* = (C_v, C_w, \{C_{i_1, i_2}\}_{i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}, i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}}),$$

where

$$C_v = v^s, \quad C_w = w^s,$$

$$\{ C_{i_1, i_2} = (h_{i_1, 0}^{y_{i_1, i_2}^{(\beta)}} \cdot h_{i_1, i_2})^s \}_{i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}, i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}},$$

for a random element $s \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$ and a random bit $\beta \in \{0, 1\}$. Here we are using, for $\beta \in \{0, 1\}$, the notation $\mathbf{y}(\beta) = [\mathbf{y}_1^{(\beta)} | \dots | \mathbf{y}_d^{(\beta)}] \in \mathbb{Z}_p^{d \cdot \mu}$, where each $\mathbf{y}_{i_1}^{(\beta)} = (y_{i_1, 1}^{(\beta)}, \dots, y_{i_1, \mu}^{(\beta)}) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\mu$, for $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}$.

At this point, $\mathcal{B}$ constructs the matrix $\{\mathbf{CT}[i_1, i_2]\}_{l_1, l_2 \in \{1, \dots, n\}}$ of HPE ciphertexts by setting

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{J}[k] &= C_v \\ \mathbf{C}_w[k, k] &= C_w \\ \mathbf{C}[i_1, i_2, k, k] &= C_{i_1, i_2} \quad \text{for } i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}, i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}. \end{aligned}$$

and, for each $l_1 \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{k\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C}_w[k, l_1] &= C_v^{\zeta[l_1]} \\ \mathbf{C}[i_1, i_2, k, l_1] &= C_v^{\gamma[i_1, i_2, k, l_1]} \quad \text{for } i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}, i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that this implicitly sets $\mathbf{s}[k] = s$, where s is the encryption exponent chosen by the HPE challenger to compute C^* . Then, for each $l_2 \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{k\}$, $\mathcal{B}$ chooses a random exponent $\mathbf{s}[l_2] \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$ and computes

$$\mathbf{J}[l_2] = v^{\mathbf{s}[l_2]} \tag{14}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C}_w[l_2, l_1] &= \mathbf{w}[l_1]^{\mathbf{s}[l_2]} && \text{for } l_1 \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{l_2\} \\ \mathbf{C}[i_1, i_2, l_2, l_1] &= \mathbf{h}[i_1, i_2, l_1]^{\mathbf{s}[l_2]} && \text{for } i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}, i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}, \\ &&& l_1 \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{l_2\} \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

As for entries of the form $\{\mathbf{C}[i_1, i_2, l, l]\}_{i_1, i_2, l \neq k}$, $\mathcal{B}$ computes them as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C}[i_1, i_2, l] &= (\mathbf{h}[i_1, 0, l]^{\mathbf{y}_{i_1}^{(0)}} [i_2] \cdot \mathbf{h}[i_1, i_2, l])^{\mathbf{s}[l]} && \text{if } l < k \\ \mathbf{C}[i_1, i_2, l] &= (\mathbf{h}[i_1, 0, l]^{\mathbf{y}_{i_1}^{(1)}} [i_2] \cdot \mathbf{h}[i_1, i_2, l])^{\mathbf{s}[l]} && \text{if } l > k. \end{aligned}$$

using the exponents $\mathbf{s}[l] \in \mathbb{Z}_p^*$ that were chosen in (14). Finally, our adversary $\mathcal{B}$ defines the $n \times n$ matrix $\{\mathbf{CT}[l_2, l_1]\}_{l_2, l_1 \in \{1, \dots, n\}}$ of HPE ciphertexts

$$\mathbf{CT}[l_2, l_1] = (\mathbf{J}[l_2], \mathbf{C}_w[l_2, l_1], \{\mathbf{C}[i_1, i_2, l_2, l_1]\}_{i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}, i_2 \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}}).$$

Finally, $\mathcal{B}$ defines $\text{mpk} := (\text{PP}_{\text{core}}, \{\mathbf{CT}[l_2, l_1]\}_{l_2, l_1 \in \{1, \dots, n\}})$ and sends it to the adversary $\mathcal{A}$.

When it comes to answer $\mathcal{A}$'s private key queries for hierarchical identities $(\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_\ell)$, $\mathcal{B}$ first encodes each level's identity $\text{id}_{i_1} \in \{0, 1\}^\mu$ as a μ -vector $\vec{X}_{i_1} = (\text{id}_{i_1}[1], \dots, \text{id}_{i_1}[\mu])$ for each $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$. Although $\mathcal{B}$ does not entirely know msk , the decryption components $(\mathbf{D}[l_1], \mathbf{D}_w[l_1], \mathbf{D}_{i_1}[l_1])$ of the private key are always directly computable when $l_1 \neq k$: namely, $\mathcal{B}$ chooses $\mathbf{D}_w[l_1] \xleftarrow{R} \hat{\mathbb{G}}$ and $\mathbf{D}_{i_1}[l_1] \xleftarrow{R} \hat{\mathbb{G}}$, for $i_1 = 1$ to ℓ , and computes

$$\mathbf{D}[l_1] = \prod_{i_1=1}^{\ell} \mathbf{D}_{i_1}[l_1]^{\sum_{i_2=1}^{\mu} \gamma[i_1, i_2, l_1] \cdot \text{id}_{i_1}[i_2]} \cdot \mathbf{D}_w[l_1]^{\zeta[l_1]}.$$

It is easy to see that $(\mathbf{D}[l_1], \mathbf{D}_w, \{\mathbf{D}_{i_1}[l_1]\}_{i_1=1}^{\ell})$ forms a decryption component of the form (9). Moreover, the delegation components can be obtained exactly in the same way.

As for the remaining coordinate $l_1 = k$, the simulator $\mathcal{B}$ aborts if, for any $\tilde{\gamma} \in \{0, 1\}$, the obtained hierarchical vector $(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)$ is one for which $\langle y_{i_1}^{(\tilde{\gamma})}, X_{i_1} \rangle = 0$ for each $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ (which translates into

$$f_{(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_\ell)}(\mathbf{y}_1^{(\tilde{\gamma})}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_d^{(\tilde{\gamma})}) = 1$$

in the predicate encryption language). Otherwise, $\mathcal{B}$ can obtain the missing private key components by invoking its HPE challenger to obtain a complete private key $\mathbf{SK}_{(\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_\ell)} = (\mathbf{SK}_D, \mathbf{SK}_{DL})$.

It is easy to check that, if the HPE challenger's bit is $\beta = 0$, mpk is distributed as in Game RL_k . In contrast, if $\beta = 1$, mpk has the same distribution as in Game RL_{k-1} . $\square$

Selective-id Security

We consider our HF with $\mu = 2$, $\Sigma_{\text{ID}} = \{(1, x) : x \in \mathbb{Z}_p^*\}$ and $\text{IdSp} = (\Sigma_{\text{ID}})^{(\leq d)}$. We show that this HIB-LTDF is selective-id $(n - \log p, 1)$ -partially lossy. Let $(\text{id}_1^*, \dots, \text{id}_{d^*}^*) \in \text{IdSp}$ be the identity chosen by the adversary. Define the sibling LHF with $\text{AuxSp} = \mathbb{Z}_p^{2d}$ and auxiliary input $\mathbf{y}^{(1)} = [\mathbf{y}_1^{(1)} | \dots | \mathbf{y}_d^{(1)}] \in \mathbb{Z}_p^{2d}$ where $\mathbf{y}_{i_1}^{(1)} = (-\text{id}_{i_1}^*, 1)$ for any $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d^*\}$ and $\mathbf{y}_{i_1}^{(1)} = (1, 0)$ for $i_1 \in \{d^* + 1, \dots, d\}$. Selective security is established in the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *Let $n > \log p$ and let $\omega = n - \log p$. Let HF be the HIB-LTDF with parameters $n, \mu = 2$, $\Sigma_{\text{ID}} = \{(1, x) : x \in \mathbb{Z}_p^*\}$ and $\text{IdSp} = (\Sigma_{\text{ID}})^{(\leq d)}$. Let LHF be the sibling associated with it as above. Let $\delta = 1$ and let $\mathcal{A}$ be a selective-id adversary. Then there exist algorithms $\mathcal{B}_1$ and $\mathcal{B}_2$ such that*

$$\text{Adv}_{\omega}^{\delta\text{-lossy}}(\mathcal{A}) \leq n \cdot ((2d + 1) \cdot \text{Adv}^{\mathcal{P}\text{-BDH}_1}(\mathcal{B}_1) + q \cdot \text{Adv}^{\mathcal{P}\text{-DDH}_2}(\mathcal{B}_2))$$

The running time of $\mathcal{B}_1$ and $\mathcal{B}_2$ are comparable to the running time of $\mathcal{A}$.

Proof. Let RL_0 and RL_n be the games specified above. We claim that $\Pr[\text{REAL}] = \Pr[RL_0]$ and $|\Pr[\text{LOSSY}] - \Pr[RL_n]| \in \text{negl}(\lambda)$, i.e the experiment will never halt outputting 0 due to the queried id or id^* except with negligible probability. This implies partial lossiness with $\delta = 1$. It is straightforward to see that the first equality is true since RL_0 generates parameters with the auxiliary input $\mathbf{y}^{(0)}$, which results in HF.Eval being an injective function for all hierarchical identities $\text{id} \in \text{IdSp}$.

To see the other equality, recall that RL_n generates the parameters with the auxiliary input $\mathbf{y}^{(1)}$ given above. Note that any identity $\text{id} = (\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_\ell)$ satisfies that $\langle \mathbf{y}_{i_1}^{(1)}, \text{id}_{i_1} \rangle = 0$ for all $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ if and only if $\text{id} = \text{id}^*$. Further, the left-hand-side member of (13) has a factor of the form

$$\prod_{i_1=1}^{\ell} e(\mathbf{h}[i_1, 0, l_1], \hat{v})^{\mathbf{s}[l_1] \cdot \mathbf{r}_{i_1}[l_1] \cdot \langle \mathbf{y}_{i_1}^{(y)}, \text{id}_{i_1} \rangle \cdot x_{l_1}}.$$

If $\text{id} \neq \text{id}^*$, with overwhelming probability, this factor is different from $1_{\mathbb{G}_T}$ if and only if $x_{l_1} \neq 0$ and the function is injective. On the other hand, this factor vanishes if $\text{id} = \text{id}^*$, which means that, for $\text{id} = \text{id}^*$, the value $\langle \mathbf{s}, X \rangle$ completely determines the whole ciphertext C . This gives at most p possible ciphertexts for 2^n inputs, which yields a lossiness $\lambda(\text{HF.Eval}(\text{pms}, \text{mpk}, (\text{id}_1^*, \dots, \text{id}_{d^*}^*), \cdot)) \geq n - \log p = \omega$. $\square$

Adaptive-id Security

For adaptive security we consider our construction of **HF** with a restricted identity space, namely taking $\Sigma_{ID} = \{(1, \mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^{\mu-1}\}$. We show that this construction is adaptive-id δ -lossy with $\delta = 1/(2 \cdot (2q\mu)^d)$ where q is the maximum number of “Reveal-key” queries of the adversary. We define a sibling **LHF** with $\text{AuxSp} = \mathbb{Z}_p^{\mu \cdot d}$, where the auxiliary input $\mathbf{y}^{(1)} = [\mathbf{y}_1^{(1)} | \dots | \mathbf{y}_d^{(1)}]$, for any i_1 from 1 to d , is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} y'_{i_1} &\stackrel{R}{\leftarrow} \{0, \dots, 2q-1\}, & \xi_{i_1} &\stackrel{R}{\leftarrow} \{0, \dots, \mu+1\}, & \mathbf{y}_{i_1}^{(1)}[1] &= y'_{i_1} - 2\xi_{i_1}q, \\ \{\mathbf{y}_{i_1}^{(1)}[i] &\stackrel{R}{\leftarrow} \{0, \dots, 2q-1\}\}_{i=2}^{\mu}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 3. *Let $n > \log p$ and let $\omega = n - \log p$. Let **HF** be the **HIB-LTDF** with parameters $n, \mu, \Sigma_{ID} = \{(1, \mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^{\mu-1}\}, \text{IdSp} = \Sigma_{ID}^{(\leq d)}$. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an adaptive-id adversary that makes a maximal number of $q \leq p/(2\mu)$ queries and let $\delta = 1/(2 \cdot (2q\mu)^d)$. Let **LHF** be the sibling with auxiliary input as above. Then, there are algorithms $\mathcal{B}_1$ and $\mathcal{B}_2$ such that*

$$\text{Adv}_{\omega}^{\delta\text{-lossy}}(\mathcal{A}) \leq 2n \cdot ((d \cdot \mu + 1) \cdot \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathcal{P}\text{-BDH}_1}(\mathcal{B}_1) + q \cdot \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathcal{P}\text{-DDH}_2}(\mathcal{B}_2)),$$

where the running time of $\mathcal{B}_1$ and $\mathcal{B}_2$ is that of $\mathcal{A}$ plus a $O(\mu^3 \cdot \rho^{-2} \cdot \ln((\mu q \rho)^{-1}))$ overhead, where $\rho = (2q)^{\ell^*} \mathbf{Adv}^{\delta\text{-lossy}}(\mathcal{A})$.

Proof. The difficulty of this proof is in relating the experiments RL_0, RL_n with the games **REAL** and **LOSSY**. This happens because the output d' of the adversary could be correlated with the fact that his queries cause the experiment to abort. For instance, we could have that the adversary perfectly distinguishes between **REAL** and **LOSSY** in game described in definition 2, but always queries for secret keys of lossy identities, while this would cause the experiments RL_0, RL_n to abort. To overcome this difficulty, we will use the technique of the artificial abort due to Waters with the improved analysis of [22].

We call $E(IS, \text{id}^*)$ the event that the experiment does not halt and outputs 0 (cases a) and b) detailed at the beginning of the subsection) over the choice of $\mathbf{Y} = \{y'_1, \dots, y'_d, \mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_d, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_d\}$ and $\eta(IS, \text{id}^*) = \Pr_{\mathbf{Y}}[E(IS, \text{id}^*)]$. To use the artificial abort technique, in Lemma 8 below we show that

$$\lambda_{\text{low}} = \frac{1}{2 \cdot (2q\mu)^{\ell^*}} \leq \eta(IS, \text{id}^*) \leq \frac{1}{(2q)^{\ell^*}} = \lambda_{\text{up}}.$$

The proof of this lemma is the main technical difficulty in translating the proof of Bellare *et al.* [7] to our setting. They use similar bounds, due to [22], but we had to extend them to the hierarchical case.

Then, as in [7], we define the games $\widehat{RL}_0$ and $\widehat{RL}_n$ that differ from RL_0 and RL_n respectively in that, before returning the final output, an artificial abort stage is added before outputting the bit d' of the adversary. Intuitively, this step destroys the (possible) existing correlation between the event that a set of secret key queries leads to an abort and the output d' . In this artificial abort stage, an approximation $\eta'(IS, \text{id}^*)$ of $\eta(IS, \text{id}^*)$ is computed. Then, if $\eta'(IS, \text{id}^*) > \lambda_{\text{low}}$ the experiment halts and returns 0 as output with probability $1 - \lambda_{\text{low}}/\eta'(IS, \text{id}^*)$. If the experiment doesn't abort, it returns the guess d' of the adversary.

We can now use [22, Lemma 6.3], which states that if we use $O(\mu^3 \cdot \rho^{-2} \cdot \ln((\mu q \rho)^{-1}))$ samples to compute the approximation $\eta'(IS, \text{id}^*)$, then

$$\lambda_{\text{low}} \Pr[\text{REAL}] - \Pr[\widehat{RL}_0] \leq \lambda_{\text{low}} \rho.$$

This implies $\lambda_{low} \Pr[\text{REAL}] \leq \Pr[\widehat{RL}_0] + \lambda_{low}\rho$. Setting $\delta = 1/(2 \cdot (2q\mu)^d)$, we have the inequality $\delta \Pr[\text{REAL}] \leq \lambda_{low} \Pr[\text{REAL}] \leq \Pr[\widehat{RL}_0] + \lambda_{low}\rho$. We use the value of δ instead of λ_{low} since the latter depends on ℓ^* , the hierarchy length of the challenge identity (and thus depends on the challenge identity), while the former only depends on d , the maximum number of hierarchical levels of the scheme.

Also, as in the selective case, we have $\Pr[\text{LOSSY}] = \Pr[RL_n]$. As $\widehat{RL}_n$ has the artificial abort, it will output 0 with more probability than RL_n . This implies that $\Pr[\text{LOSSY}] = \Pr[RL_n] \geq \Pr[\widehat{RL}_n]$.

Putting it all together we have that

$$\delta \Pr[\text{REAL}] - \Pr[\text{LOSSY}] \leq \Pr[\widehat{RL}_0] - \Pr[\widehat{RL}_n] + \rho\lambda_{low}.$$

The left hand side to the equation is precisely $\mathbf{Adv}^{\delta\text{-lossy}}(\mathcal{A})$. Using a modified version of Lemma 6 adding the artificial abort stage, we can see that the right hand side of the equation is lesser or equal than $n \cdot ((d \cdot \mu + 1) \cdot \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathcal{P}\text{-BDH}_1}(\mathcal{B}_1) + q \cdot \mathbf{Adv}^{\mathcal{P}\text{-DDH}_2}(\mathcal{B}_2)) + \rho\lambda_{low}$. Setting $\rho = \mathbf{Adv}^{\delta\text{-lossy}}(\mathcal{A}) / (2\lambda_{low})$ gives us the statement of the theorem. $\square$

Lemma 8. $\lambda_{low} = \frac{1}{2 \cdot (2q(\mu+1))^{\ell^*}} \leq \eta(IS, \text{id}^*) \leq \frac{1}{(2q)^{\ell^*}} = \lambda_{up}$

Proof. Fix the view of the adversary $\mathcal{A}$, which implies fixing the queried identities $\text{id}^{(1)}, \dots, \text{id}^{(q)}, \text{id}^*$. Although we are assuming that the adversary $\mathcal{A}$ makes the maximum number of queries, with a smaller number of queries we would have the same bounds. We abbreviate $\eta = \eta(IS, \text{id}^*)$, $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}^{(1)}$ and also call ℓ^* the depth of the challenge identity id^* . For an integer t , define the event

$$E_t : \bigwedge_{i=1}^q \left(\bigvee_{i_1=1}^{\ell^{(i)}} \left(\langle \text{id}_{i_1}^{(i)}, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle \neq 0 \pmod{t} \right) \right) \wedge \bigwedge_{i_1=1}^{\ell^*} \left(\langle \text{id}_{i_1}^*, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle = 0 \pmod{t} \right)$$

We denote $\mathbf{Y} = \{y'_1, \dots, y'_d, \mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_d, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_d\}$. For all $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell^*\}$, we have

$$\langle \text{id}_{i_1}, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle = y'_{i_1} + \sum_{k=2}^{\mu} \mathbf{y}_{i_1}[k] \text{id}_{i_1}[k] - 2\xi_{i_1}q$$

for some $0 \leq \xi_{i_1} \leq \mu - 1$. In particular, observe that

$$0 \leq y'_{i_1} + \sum_{k=2}^{\mu} \mathbf{y}_{i_1}[k] \text{id}_{i_1}[k] < 2q\mu < p.$$

Let us define the value $\xi_{i_1}^* := \lfloor (y'_{i_1} + \sum_{k=2}^{\mu} \mathbf{y}_{i_1}[k] \text{id}_{i_1}^*[k]) / 2q \rfloor$. If we have the two conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{i_1} &= \xi_{i_1}^* & \text{for each } i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell^*\} \\ \langle \text{id}_{i_1}^*, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle &= 0 \pmod{2q}, \end{aligned}$$

then clearly $\langle \text{id}_{i_1}^*, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle = 0 \pmod p$. Also, if $\langle \text{id}_{i_1}, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle \neq 0 \pmod{2q}$, then we also have $\langle \text{id}_{i_1}, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle \neq 0 \pmod p$. Using these observations, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta &\geq \Pr[\xi_{i_1} = \xi_{i_1}^* \quad \forall i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell^*\}] \Pr_{\mathbf{Y}}[E_p \mid \xi_{i_1} = \xi_{i_1}^* \quad \forall i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell^*\}] \\
&= \frac{1}{\mu^{\ell^*}} \Pr_{\mathbf{Y}}[E_p \mid \xi_{i_1} = \xi_{i_1}^* \quad \forall i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell^*\}] \\
&\geq \frac{1}{\mu^{\ell^*}} \Pr_{\mathbf{Y}}[E_{2q} \mid \xi_{i_1} = \xi_{i_1}^* \quad \forall i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell^*\}] \\
&= \frac{1}{\mu^{\ell^*}} \Pr_{\mathbf{Y}'}[E_{2q} \mid \xi_{i_1} = \xi_{i_1}^* \quad \forall i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell^*\}]
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{Y}'$ contains $\{\mathbf{y}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}'_d\}$ and $\mathbf{y}'_{i_1} = (y'_{i_1}, \mathbf{y}_{i_1}[2], \dots, \mathbf{y}_{i_1}[\mu])$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. Note that the second inequality above holds because of the condition $\xi_{i_1} = \xi_{i_1}^*$. If we now define $\eta_{2q} = \Pr_{\mathbf{Y}'}[E_{2q} \mid \xi_{i_1} = \xi_{i_1}^* \quad \forall i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell^*\}]$, we just showed that $\eta \geq \frac{1}{\mu^{\ell^*}} \cdot \eta_{2q}$. Trivially, we also have the bound $\eta_{2q} \geq \eta$.

Now, we observe some facts about $\langle \text{id}_{i_1}, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle$. First, observe that $\langle \text{id}_{i_1}, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle$ and $\langle \text{id}_{i'_1}, \mathbf{y}_{i'_1} \rangle$ are independent for $i_1 \neq i'_1$. This is because of the way $\mathbf{Y}$ is chosen.

Also, note that for any id_{i_1} , $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\Pr_{\mathbf{Y}'}[\langle \text{id}_{i_1}, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle = a \pmod{2q}] = 1/2q$. This is because for any choice of $\mathbf{y}_{i_1}[2], \dots, \mathbf{y}_{i_1}[\mu]$, there is only one value of y'_{i_1} for which the equality holds.

Consider $\text{id} = (\text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_\ell) \neq \text{id}' = (\text{id}'_1, \dots, \text{id}'_{\ell'})$ and id not being a prefix of id' and $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$. First, if $\ell > \ell'$, for each $i_1 \in \{\ell' + 1, \dots, \ell\}$ such that $\text{id}_{i_1} \neq \text{id}'_{i_1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr_{\mathbf{Y}'}[\langle \text{id}_{i_1}, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle = a \pmod{2q} \mid \bigwedge_{k=1}^{\ell'} \langle \text{id}'_k, \mathbf{y}_k \rangle = b \pmod{2q}] \\
= \Pr_{\mathbf{Y}'}[\langle \text{id}_{i_1}, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle = a \pmod{2q}] = 1/2q.
\end{aligned}$$

This happens because $\bigwedge_{k=1}^{\ell'} \langle \text{id}'_k, \mathbf{y}_k \rangle = b \pmod{2q}$ does not impose any condition on $\langle \text{id}_{i_1}, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle$ and we can apply the same arguments as previously.

On the other hand, for all $i_1 \leq \ell'$, $\Pr_{\mathbf{Y}'}[\langle \text{id}_{i_1}, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle = a \pmod{2q} \mid \bigwedge_{k=1}^{\ell'} \langle \text{id}'_k, \mathbf{y}_k \rangle = b \pmod{2q}]$ is either 0, if $\text{id}_{i_1} = \text{id}'_{i_1}$ or $1/2q$, if $\text{id}_{i_1} \neq \text{id}'_{i_1}$. The second fact is because, if $\text{id}_{i_1} \neq \text{id}'_{i_1}$, there exists an index j for which $\text{id}_{i_1}[j] = 1$ and $\text{id}'_{i_1}[j] = 0$ or the other way around. We see that, if we fix all $\mathbf{y}_{i_1}[i]$ for $i \neq j$ so that $\langle \text{id}'_{i_1}, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle = b \pmod{2q}$, then there is only one value for $\mathbf{y}_{i_1}[j]$ so that $\langle \text{id}_{i_1}, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle = a \pmod{2q}$.

With all these observations, we calculate the following bound on η_{2q} :

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta_{2q} &= \Pr_{\mathbf{Y}'} \left[\bigwedge_{i=1}^q \left(\bigvee_{i_1=1}^{\ell^{(i)}} \left(\langle \text{id}_{i_1}^{(i)}, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle \neq 0 \pmod{2q} \right) \right) \mid \bigwedge_{i_1=1}^{\ell^*} \left(\langle \text{id}_{i_1}^*, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle = 0 \pmod{2q} \right) \right] \\
&\quad \cdot \Pr_{\mathbf{Y}'} \left[\bigwedge_{i_1=1}^{\ell^*} \left(\langle \text{id}_{i_1}^*, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle = 0 \pmod{2q} \right) \right] \\
&= 1/(2q)^{\ell^*} \Pr_{\mathbf{Y}'} \left[\bigwedge_{i=1}^q \left(\bigvee_{i_1=1}^{\ell^{(i)}} \left(\langle \text{id}_{i_1}^{(i)}, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle \neq 0 \pmod{2q} \right) \right) \mid \bigwedge_{i_1=1}^{\ell^*} \left(\langle \text{id}_{i_1}^*, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle = 0 \pmod{2q} \right) \right] \\
&= 1/(2q)^{\ell^*} \left(1 - \Pr_{\mathbf{Y}'} \left[\bigvee_{i=1}^q \left(\bigwedge_{i_1=1}^{\ell^{(i)}} \left(\langle \text{id}_{i_1}^{(i)}, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle = 0 \pmod{2q} \right) \right) \mid \bigwedge_{i_1=1}^{\ell^*} \left(\langle \text{id}_{i_1}^*, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle = 0 \pmod{2q} \right) \right] \right) \\
&\quad (16) \\
&\geq 1/(2q)^{\ell^*} \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^q \Pr_{\mathbf{Y}'} \left[\bigwedge_{i_1=1}^{\ell^{(i)}} \left(\langle \text{id}_{i_1}^{(i)}, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle = 0 \pmod{2q} \right) \mid \bigwedge_{i_1=1}^{\ell^*} \left(\langle \text{id}_{i_1}^*, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle = 0 \pmod{2q} \right) \right] \right)
\end{aligned}$$

We now focus on how to bound

$$\Pr_{\mathbf{Y}'} \left[\bigwedge_{i_1=1}^{\ell^{(i)}} \left(\langle \text{id}_{i_1}^{(i)}, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle = 0 \pmod{2q} \right) \mid \bigwedge_{i_1=1}^{\ell^*} \left(\langle \text{id}_{i_1}^*, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle = 0 \pmod{2q} \right) \right].$$

To this end, we consider two cases: that $\ell^{(i)} > \ell^*$ or $\ell^{(i)} \leq \ell^*$. In the first case, for each $i_1 \in \{\ell^* + 1, \dots, \ell^{(i)}\}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr_{\mathbf{Y}'} \left[\langle \text{id}_{i_1}^{(i)}, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle = 0 \pmod{2q} \mid \bigwedge_{k=1}^{\ell^*} \left(\langle \text{id}_k^*, \mathbf{y}_k \rangle = 0 \pmod{2q} \right) \right] \\
= \Pr_{\mathbf{Y}'} \left[\langle \text{id}_{i_1}^{(i)}, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle = 0 \pmod{2q} \right] = 1/2q.
\end{aligned}$$

For all indices $i_1 \in \ell^*$, the same probability is either 1 or $1/(2q)$.

If $\ell^{(i)} \leq \ell^*$, for each $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, \ell^{(i)}\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr_{\mathbf{Y}'} \left[\langle \text{id}_{i_1}^{(i)}, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle = 0 \pmod{2q} \mid \bigwedge_{k=1}^{\ell^*} \left(\langle \text{id}_k^*, \mathbf{y}_k \rangle = 0 \pmod{2q} \right) \right] \\
= \Pr_{\mathbf{Y}'} \left[\langle \text{id}_{i_1}^{(i)}, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle = 0 \pmod{2q} \mid \langle \text{id}_{i_1}^*, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle = 0 \pmod{2q} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

which is 1 if $\text{id}_{i_1}^{(i)} = \text{id}_{i_1}^*$ and $1/(2q)$ otherwise due to the fact stated above.

Define $\chi_1^{(i)} = \max(\ell^{(i)} - \ell^*, 0)$ and $\chi_2^{(i)} = \#\{1 \leq i_1 \leq \min(\ell^*, \ell^{(i)}) \mid \text{id}_{i_1}^{(i)} \neq \text{id}_{i_1}^*\}$. Note that, by the restrictions imposed on $\text{id}^{(i)}$, we have $\chi_1^{(i)} + \chi_2^{(i)} \geq 1$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, q\}$. Putting it all together,

we find

$$\Pr_{\mathbf{Y}'} \left[\bigwedge_{i_1=1}^{\ell^{(i)}} \left(\langle \text{id}_{i_1}^{(i)}, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle = 0 \pmod{2q} \right) \mid \bigwedge_{i_1=1}^{\ell^*} \left(\langle \text{id}_{i_1}^*, \mathbf{y}_{i_1} \rangle = 0 \pmod{2q} \right) \right] = \frac{1}{(2q)^{\chi_1^{(i)} + \chi_2^{(i)}}} \leq \frac{1}{(2q)}$$

We can conclude that $\eta_{2q} \geq 1/(2^{\ell^*+1}q^{\ell^*})$. For the upper bound on η_{2q} , we have $\eta_{2q} \leq 1/(2q)^{\ell^*}$, where we use that $(1 - \Pr[\dots]) \leq 1$ in (16). Combining these bounds with the bounds on η , we get the statement of the Lemma. $\square$

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Mihir Bellare for clarifying that IB-LTDFs are not known to imply indistinguishability-based selective-opening security in the identity-based setting.

References

1. S. Agrawal, D. Boneh, X. Boyen. Efficient Lattice (H)IBE in the Standard Model. *Eurocrypt'10*, pp. 553–572, 2010.
2. S. Agrawal, D. Boneh, X. Boyen. Lattice Basis Delegation in Fixed Dimension and Shorter-Ciphertext Hierarchical IBE. *Crypto'10*, pp. 98–115, 2010.
3. R. Anderson. Two Remarks on Public Key Cryptology. Invited lecture, *ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 1997.
4. M. Bellare, A. Boldyreva, A. O'Neill. Deterministic Encryption: Definitional Equivalences and Constructions without Random Oracles. In *Crypto'07*,
5. M. Bellare, Z. Brakerski, M. Naor, T. Ristenpart, G. Segev, H. Shacham, S. Yilek. Hedged Public-Key Encryption: How to Protect against Bad Randomness. In *Asiacrypt'09*, pp. 232–249, 2009.
6. M. Bellare, D. Hofheinz, S. Yilek. Possibility and Impossibility Results for Encryption and Commitment Secure under Selective Opening. In *Eurocrypt'09*, pp. 1–35, 2009.
7. M. Bellare, E. Kiltz, C. Peikert, B. Waters. Identity-Based (Lossy) Trapdoor Functions and Applications. In *Eurocrypt'12*, to appear, 2012.
8. A. Boldyreva, S. Fehr, A. O'Neill. On Notions of Security for Deterministic Encryption, and Efficient Constructions without Random Oracles. In *Crypto'08*, 2008.
9. D. Boneh, B. Waters. Conjunctive, Subset, and Range Queries on Encrypted Data. In *4th Theory of Cryptography Conference (TCC 2007)*, pp. 535–554, 2007.
10. X. Boyen, B. Waters. Anonymous Hierarchical Identity-Based Encryption (Without Random Oracles). In *Crypto'06*, pp. 290–307, 2006.
11. X. Boyen, B. Waters. Shrinking the Keys of Discrete-Log-Type Lossy Trapdoor Functions. In *ACNS'10*, pp. 35–52, 2010.
12. R. Canetti, S. Halevi, J. Katz. A Forward-Secure Public-Key Encryption Scheme. In *Eurocrypt'03*, pp. 254–271, 2003.
13. R. Canetti, S. Halevi, J. Katz. Chosen-Ciphertext Security from Identity-Based Encryption. In *Eurocrypt'04*, pp. 207–222, 2004.
14. D. Cash, D. Hofheinz, E. Kiltz, C. Peikert. Bonsai Trees, or How to Delegate a Lattice Basis. In *Eurocrypt'10*, pp. 523–552, 2004.
15. L. Ducas. Anonymity from Asymmetry: New Constructions for Anonymous HIBE. In *CT-RSA'10, LNCS 5985*, pp. 148–164, 2010.
16. D. Freeman, O. Goldreich, E. Kiltz, A. Rosen, G. Segev. More Constructions of Lossy and Correlation-Secure Trapdoor Functions. In *PKC'10*, pp. 279–295, 2010.
17. C. Gentry, A. Silverberg. Hierarchical ID-Based Cryptography. In *Asiacrypt'02, LNCS 2501*, pp. 548–566, 2002.

18. V. Goyal, O. Pandey, A. Sahai, B. Waters. Attribute-based encryption for fine-grained access control of encrypted data. In *ACM CCS'06*, pp. 89–98, 2006.
19. B. Hemenway, R. Ostrovsky. Lossy Trapdoor Functions from Smooth Homomorphic Hash Proof Systems. In *Electronic Colloquium on Computational Complexity (ECCC)* 16: 127, 2009.
20. D. Hofheinz. All-But-Many Lossy Trapdoor Functions. In *Eurocrypt'12*, to appear, 2012.
21. J. Katz, A. Sahai, B. Waters. Predicate Encryption Supporting Disjunctions, Polynomial Equations, and Inner Products. In *Eurocrypt'08*, pp. 146–162, 2008.
22. E. Kiltz, D. Galindo. Direct chosen-ciphertext secure identity-based key encapsulation without random oracles. In *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 410(47–49), 2009.
23. P. Mol, S. Yilek. Chosen-Ciphertext Security from Slightly Lossy Trapdoor Functions. In *PKC'10*, pp. 296–311, 2010.
24. T. Okamoto, K. Takashima. Hierarchical Predicate Encryption for Inner-Products. In *Asiacrypt'09*, pp. 214–231, 2009.
25. C. Peikert, B. Waters. Lossy trapdoor functions and their applications. In *STOC'08*, ACM Press, pp. 187–196, 2008.
26. A. Sahai, B. Waters. Fuzzy Identity-Based Encryption In *Eurocrypt'05*, pp. 457–473, 2005.
27. E. Shi, B. Waters. Delegating Capabilities in Predicate Encryption Systems. In *ICALP'08*, pp. 560–578, 2008.
28. A. Shamir. Identity-Based Cryptosystems and Signature Schemes. In *Crypto'84*, pp. 47–53, 1984.
29. H. Wee. Dual Projective Hashing and its Applications - Lossy Trapdoor Functions and More. In *Eurocrypt'12*, to appear, 2012.